

JPRS 84724

10 November 1983

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 12, August 1983

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

10 November 1983

USSR REPORT

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 12, August 1983

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

CONTENTS

A Party of Revolutionary Action (M. V. Zimyanin)	1
Peace, the Working Class and the Communists	19
Karl Marx and Fundamental Questions of Aesthetics (M. Ovsyannikov)	31
Capital Construction Under the Conditions of Intensification and the Financial-Credit Mechanism	43
Bank Credit: Economic Incentives and Levers (V. Rybin)	56
On the Political Approach to Economics (P. Ignatovskiy)	64
Communists' International Rostrum	79
From Our Experience (Stanislaw Wroncki)	90
Important Factor of Peace (V. Sobakin, V. Shaposhnikov)	102
'Psychopolitics' and What It Conceals (S. Roshchin)	112
Counterrevolution for Export (V. Nikolayev)	124
Comprehensive Approach to Reducing Manual Labor	127

A Party Committee Studies Public Opinion (V. Korobeynikov)	138
Basic Work on the History of the Working Class in Russia (F. Vaganov)	145

PUBLICATION DATA

English title	: TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 18 August 1983
Russian title	: KOMMUNIST
Author (s)	:
Editor (s)	: R. I. Kosolapov
Publishing House	: Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"
Place of Publication	: Moscow
Date of Publication	: August 1983
Signed to press	: 11 Aug 83
Copies	: 835,000
COPYRIGHT	: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

A PARTY OF REVOLUTIONARY ACTION

PM010730 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83) pp 3-18

[Report delivered by CPSU Central Committee Secretary M. V. Zimyanin on 29 July 1983 at ceremonial session marking the 80th anniversary of the Second RSDWP Congress]

[Text] Comrades!

The Second Russian Social Democratic Workers Party [RSDWP] Congress took place 80 years ago. At that time, at the dawn of the 20th century, few people were able to assess at its true worth the great meaning of this event. But less than a decade and a half elapsed and the party of Bolshevik-Leninists which had been formed at the congress led the working class and the working people of Russia to the first victorious socialist revolution which opened a new epoch in world history.

How did the Bolshevik Party succeed in preparing and heading a social revolution of unprecedented scale and depth which shook to its foundations the old society of coercion and oppression and laid the foundations of a new socialist civilization? Even under contemporary conditions the answer to this question is not only of theoretical but also practical interest. It has the most direct bearing on the problem of the struggle for mankind's social progress.

"The ideas of communism," K. Marx observed, "are perfectly sufficient to destroy the ideas of private ownership. But real communist action is required in order to destroy private ownership as it actually exists" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 42, p 136). Lenin's party which was created at the Second Congress indeed became a party of real communist action. And that is what it remains to this day.

An unbreakable thread of revolutionary continuity links the CPSU's activity with its ideological and organizational principles, with the principles of bolshevik, Leninist ethics which are inseparable from genuinely revolutionary policy. All this has invariably served for Soviet communists as a source of tremendous energy and creativity, and has inspired them to mass heroism at the tensest moments of our country's life. And now, encountering fundamentally new tasks and problems, we direct our gaze to the experience and heroic feat of those who laid the foundations of our party, who pointed out to the Russian proletariat the only true path in the struggle for socialism.

The CPSU's life is rich in accomplishments; it is dynamic and purposeful. Its scientifically regulated Leninist course is consistent and clean. Enshrined in the decisions of the 26th Party Congress and of the CPSU Central Committee November 1982 Plenum, this course received further development at the Central Committee June 1983 Plenum, whose decisions were greeted with unanimous support from the communists and all Soviet people and generated great political and labor enthusiasm in the country. The election of Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, as chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, was fervently approved by the party and people (prolonged applause).

These important political events convincingly demonstrated once again the inviolable unity of the party and people and their cohesion around the Leninist Central Committee of the CPSU and its Politburo, headed by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov. They have shown once again the creative might of our party and its unshakeable loyalty to Lenin's cause and to Lenin's banner! (Applause)

1. A Party of a New Type, the Party of Great October

Comrades! The Second RSDWP Congress met in difficult historical conditions. Capitalism has already entered its final imperialist stage. Its internal contradictions had reached unprecedented acuteness, interimperialist rivalry had increased sharply and carried the seeds of world war. At the same time, mass action by the proletariat was gathering momentum and encompassing an increasing number of countries. An explosion was ready to occur in the colonial and dependent countries. Mankind stood on the threshold of a new historical stage--the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism.

The social democratic parties of the Second International proved incapable of understanding the essence of these processes and of rousing the working class to a decisive struggle against capital. They became deeply bogged down in opportunism and reformism. A party was needed that was capable, to use Lenin's words, of correctly expressing the ideas and policy of a truly revolutionary proletariat (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch" [Complete Collected Works], vol 31, p 177). The RSDWP became just such a party. This was convincingly shown by the Second RSDWP Congress.

It is not by chance that the first proletarian party of a new type emerged in Russia. The acute contradictions of monopoly capitalism were interwoven here with the remnants of patriarchy and feudalism, the political oppression of tsarism, and the colonial subjugation of outlying national backwaters. It was precisely in Russia, which had proved to be the weakest link in imperialism, that a very great social revolution was ripening, as Marx had foreseen. Here a mighty detachment of the working class, which was marked by a high degree of concentration, determination, and growing organization, emerged into the arena of revolutionary struggle.

In its struggle, the Russian proletariat relied on the rich revolutionary traditions laid down by the Radishchev and the Decembrists, Herzen and Chernyshevskiy, the Narodnaya Volya supporters and Plekhanov's "Liberation of Labor" group. There were, of course, errors and delusions in Russia's liberation movement, but there were also countless heroic feats by people noble

of heart and valorous in spirit, who passionately desired happiness for the people and who were self-sacrificing to the ultimate degree. Through suffering, Russia really did earn the right to become the cradle of a new world. But in order that the revolutionary pressure of the proletariat might build up sufficient power to crush the exploiters, it had to be directed by advanced scientific theory.

The decisive step in combining scientific socialism with Russia's worker's movement is inseparable from the name of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin--the great leader of the proletariat, consistent continuer of the cause of Marx and Engels, brilliant theoretician and politician, and fearless revolutionary. His theoretical, propaganda, and organizational activity got under way as of the beginning of the 1890s. He became the founder of the "Alliance for the Struggle To Liberate the Working Class"--the prototype of the party of a new type. Lenin's ISKRA worthily continued the relay of revolutionary struggle and the tireless gathering together and rallying of all party forces. Relying firmly on the theory of Marxism, Lenin put forward and defended all the fundamental principles of the new and higher form of political organization of the proletariat and created the harmonious teachings on the communist party.

The basic distinctive feature of the new type of party is that it is targeted toward revolution and toward the socialist reorganization of society. The party acts as the vanguard of the working class and of all the working people in this struggle, due to the fact that it is guided by a revolutionary theory--Marxism--implements a principled revolutionary strategy, and employs flexible tactics.

It always relies on the masses and draws up the kind of norms for its internal life and shapes party members of such a type that ensures unified and cohesive actions by communists. All these main traits of the new type of party were embodied in the party of bolsheviks.

The historic merit of the Second RSDWP Congress was the adoption of a consistently Marxist program--the first program of our party. As distinct from all the West European workers' parties, the program openly proclaimed the necessity for the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to accomplish a social revolution. The agrarian part of the program clearly expressed Lenin's idea of an alliance of the proletariat with the toiling peasantry, and the demand for the right of nations to self-determination expresses the course toward the proletariat's alliance with the oppressed people of Russia. The congress solidly confirmed the party's adherence to the positions of proletarian internationalism by declaring that the RSDWP is one of the detachments of the world army of the proletariat.

The very logic of revolutionary struggle suggested that only a centralized, militant party can become the true political and ideological leader of the working class. The solution of this task was directly dependent on the quality of the party ranks. Hence that principled stance that Lenin and the Leninists adopted at the Second RSDWP Congress on the question of party membership. A conscious, disciplined political fighter and not a kind of pampered volunteer such as Martov and his supporters had proposed--that is the

kind of party person a member must be, in Lenin's opinion. Lenin's viewpoint soon became irreversibly confirmed in our rules.

From the time of the Second Party Congress a tireless struggle began that continued through all its subsequent history in order to raise higher and still higher, as Lenin used to appeal, "the concept of the party organization, party tenacity and honor, and the party banner" (op. cit., vol 7, p 351). Lenin's activity and that of his supporters was a graphic example of how firmly and resolutely it is necessary to defend the revolutionary ideas of Marxism to the end by rebuffing the fainthearted, the revisionists, and the bourgeois nationalists, when it is a question of fundamental principles. In an implacable struggle against opportunists of every stripe bolshevism matured, became tempered and strong, and won over to its side everything honest and everyone capable of thought in the revolutionary liberation movement.

The attacks by mensheviks and other opportunists at the Second Congress were in fact waged against the very foundations--ideological and organizational--of the party, and above all against those which subsequently were developed into the precise principles of democratic centralism and into the unshakeable norms of our party life. Behind the accusations against the bolsheviks to the effect that they were, as it was claimed, creating a "Blanquist" organization and behind the refusal to observe party-mindedness in everything, there in fact lurked just one thing: the fear of taking upon oneself the difficult obligations of the vanguard of the revolution, a desire to weaken the party's shock and organizing power.

We can see that even today the opportunists and revisionists continue their attacks on the basic organizational principle of the Marxist-Leninist parties--democratic centralism. They try to pass it off as the chief obstacle to the development of broad intraparty democracy and to the establishment of correct mutual relations between the party and the people's masses. In this respect they are no different from the Russian opportunists of the beginning of the century whose views have been overturned by life itself.

The Second RSDWP Congress is of permanent significance from the viewpoint not only of the formulation of the party's programmatic and organizational principles but also of its practical revolutionary strategy and tactics. Lenin and the bolsheviks consistently upheld at the congress the main factor guaranteeing the success of the revolutionary struggle--the establishment of the hegemony of the proletariat. While perceiving the party as the vanguard of the working class, they at the same time asserted its role as the defender of all exploited people, of all the working people, and as the organizer of their struggle. Thus with their very first steps the bolsheviks were preparing the mass army which followed them through the fire of three revolutions to storm the strongholds of autocracy and capitalism.

The historic rightness of the party of bolsheviks was demonstrated by the most complex and rigorous examination as only social practice could devise--the Great October Socialist Revolution. Our ideological adversaries try to depict the triumphal victory of October sometimes as a "fortuitous coincidence of circumstances," sometimes as a honed-to-perfection "conspiracy" by a

narrow group of revolutionaries. Nothing is further from the truth than speculations of this type.

The socialist revolution, as well as socialism in general, can only be the affair of the people themselves. Lenin--a genuine people's leader [narodnyy vozhd] who had infinite faith in the creative genius of the masses--never tired of emphasizing this idea. The party is invincible if it not only teaches the working people but also learns from them. The bolsheviks' strength lies in the fact that they were capable of listening to and hearing the voice of the masses, of expressing the latter's fundamental interests and leading their march. Not a single honest politician who sets about studying the bolsheviks' activity can ignore the fact that our party, in moving to meet the proletarian revolution, was fundamentally prepared for it.

The party was prepared above all politically and practically. The revolution of 1905-1907--the first popular revolution of the imperialist epoch--became, in Lenin's words, a "general rehearsal" for both the February and October revolutions of 1917. At its barricades the masses acquired priceless combat experience. In this revolution the creativity of the masses brought forth the soviets. Here the science and art of revolution were conceived, the weapon of struggle was sharpened, and forms and methods of action which it had been impossible to predict in advance were mastered.

It was precisely during the two democratic revolutions preceding October that bolshevik convictions gradually became the convictions of the broadest strata of the working people. It was then that the party learned in practice--and learned well!--to utilize any path to develop the revolution, peaceful or armed, and to learn not only from victories but also from temporary defeats.

October's victory was prepared by the bolsheviks in the theoretical sense as well. There is not one major issue of the theory of socialist revolution that was not elaborated by the party and by Lenin, and elaborated profoundly and opportunely: the development of the bourgeois democratic revolution into the socialist revolution and the strategy of the proletariat's class alliances; the possibility of the victory of the revolution in one country; the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war; the revolutionary situation; the art of revolt; the soviets as a form of proletarian statehood--all these and other most important problems were worked on in light of the theory and policy of revolutionary Marxism before the acquisition of power by the proletariat.

Lenin's contribution to the strategy and tactics of the proletariat's struggle is inseparable from the entire wealth of his ideas linked with the creative development of philosophy, political economy, and scientific communism. Lenin understood better than anyone else the exceptional importance of the constant enrichment of Marxist theory. By profoundly interpreting the new phenomena in the life of mankind and the problems arising from the rapid development of science and technology, and by generalizing the experience of the Russian and the entire international workers movement, Lenin moved forward all the component parts of our great teaching which we rightly call Marxism-Leninism.

After the victory of the revolution the party, with unusual vigor, set about accomplishing those ideals that it had upheld since the moment of its birth. During the civil war, after routing the forces of internal counterrevolution and foreign armed intervention, the working people of our country set about building socialism under the party's leadership.

Ahead, before the next terrible military ordeal, lay just 2 decades of peaceful labor for our motherland. And one cannot fail to admire the greatness and heroism of the people, and the wisdom of the party guiding the latter's creative energy. In this short span of time they succeeded in laying a path equivalent to centuries (prolonged applause).

2. The CPSU--The Party of Socialist Creation

Comrades! The more one reflects on the historical facts, the clearer one's perception of the titanic scale of the activity of Lenin and the communist party in being able both to present in a theoretically honed form the main stages and paths of the formation of the new society and to organize the purposeful revolutionary transforming activity of the millions-strong masses. Lenin's plan for the building of socialism is a brilliant model of the genuinely creative application of the fundamental principles of scientific communism to our country's concrete conditions.

Lenin himself expressed the distinctiveness of these conditions with that profundity of generalization and realism characteristic of him. "...We, the proletarians of Russia," he pointed out, "are ahead of any Britain and any Germany in terms of our political system and of the strength of the political power of the workers, and at the same time we are behind the most backward of the Western European states in terms of the organization of respectable state capitalism, the extent of cultural development, and the degree of preparation for the 'introduction' of socialism into physical production" (op. cit., vol 36, p 306).

However, those people who, referring to the backwardness of the Russia of that time, deny the international significance of the experience of socialist building in the USSR and go on and on about its alleged unsuitability for the "highly developed West" are radically in error. Because the core of our experience is the successful solution of the fundamental tasks that inevitably face any country taking the path of socialist transformations. And, in resolving these tasks, the party relied on the mighty creative forces that issued from the sociopolitical superiority of Soviet Russia over any of the capitalist countries, and on the laboring people's powerful support for the worker-peasant power.

The ascent to the heights that our country has attained was incredibly complex. The surmounting of the economic backwardness inherited from tsarism, the wartime devastation and illiteracy was accomplished under conditions of the frantic resistance of the overthrown exploiter classes and the imperialists' unceasing attempts to stifle the people's power. To some people it seemed that the building of socialism in such conditions was a hopeless cause. The right and "left" oppositionists repeatedly attempted to dislodge

the party from its Leninist course and to impose on it capitulationist or adventurist goals. But nothing could weaken its determination to realize the aims of its great founder.

Industrialization, collectivization, the cultural revolution, the development of the national backwaters... It is always with emotion that we pronounce these words. Within them beats the pulse of the socialist youth of the land of the soviets, within them is audible the triumphal march--brimming with enthusiasm--of the first five-year plans, within them is the awareness of our socialist primogeniture.

Of course, everything did not always happen just as we had intended; mistakes did occur.

But the party was able to acknowledge the mistakes in Leninist fashion, boldly and openly, to expose and eliminate the reasons that gave rise to them, and to lift the working people for the solution of new tasks.

As early as the 1930s, socialism had basically been built in our country through the heroic efforts of Soviet people led by Lenin's party. The solid moral and political unity of society had taken shape and all the nations and ethnic groups had merged into a harmonious, indestructible family.

All this enabled the Soviet state to hold out and to triumph in the most arduous historical trials, the grimmest of which was the Great Patriotic War. Under the party's leadership the valiant Soviet Army and people not only upheld the freedom, honor, and independence of the motherland in the fight to the death against the fascist aggressor but also made the decisive contribution to mankind's deliverance from Nazi enslavement (applause). The sons and daughters of our fatherland fought heroically on the front lines and in the partisan detachments and toiled selflessly in the rear, together forging the great victory. The restoration in a very short space of time of an economy devastated by the enemy also was a nationwide exploit.

The socioeconomic and spiritual progress achieved by Soviet society in the postwar decades has been enormous. Its main result has been the building of developed socialism, which embodies the highest degree of man's social progress in our time.

Nowadays, when revolutionary practice has been enriched by the manifold experience of the building of socialism in a number of countries of Europe, Asia, and Latin America, it has been conclusively confirmed that certain features in the development of the land of the soviets do not abrogate--as indeed Lenin foresaw--the basic laws of socialist building that manifested themselves for the first time precisely in our country. The establishment of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which, as our experience shows, develops gradually into the state of the whole people; the leadership of society's development by the Marxist-Leninist party; the socialization of the means of production, the planned management of the national economy, the participation of the broadest masses in the management of social and state affairs, the communist education of the working people--these and other ways

and means of our movement toward socialism have proven their international significance.

That is why the Leninist science of socialist building and the experience of its implementation in the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries have been and remain reliable pointers for all revolutionary forces (applause). They warn against attempts to replace a really scientific analysis of new social phenomena with the composition of speculative utopias, and to replace the elaboration of a strategy leading to genuinely socialist transformations with a quest for so-called "alternative models" of socialism that have been accomplished nowhere and by no one.

Real socialism has contributed major achievements of significance for all mankind to the treasurehouse of civilization and has successfully resolved in the interests of working people problems that are beyond the power of capitalism to resolve. A dynamic economy free from crises and unemployment, the steady upsurge of the people's well-being, genuine democracy ensuring the basic human rights not in words, but in deeds; the just resolution of the nationalities question; universal free education and health care; leading science at the service of the people; a developed multinational culture--all these aspects of our life are of tremendous magnetic force in the eyes of working people throughout the world.

Socialism engenders a social climate in which the collectivist spirit and comradely mutual assistance, moral health and social optimism predominate.

It creates the material and spiritual conditions for the increasingly full, all-around development and application of the individual's creative forces and capacities. It ensures a fundamentally new quality of life that is by no means limited to material sufficiency, but incorporates all the wealth of full-blooded human existence, the whole spectrum of genuinely human values.

Comrades! On the basis of a strictly scientific assessment of the achievements and potential of Soviet society and in the light of the real dynamics of internal and international factors, at its 26th Congress the CPSU elaborated a detailed program for the country's economic and social development for the 11th Five-Year Plan and for the 1980s as a whole. The struggle to fulfill it is at the center of the efforts of the party and all the Soviet people.

The CPSU's unshakeable Leninist tradition is to constantly generalize the experience accumulated, test its strategy against life, and on this basis creatively enrich the arsenal of theory and concretize the political course. The CPSU Central Committee November 1982 and June 1983 plenums and speeches by Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of our party's Central Committee, were important milestones here. It is no exaggeration to say that a major new step forward has been taken in the development of the theory of mature socialism and in the understanding of the nature of the long-term tasks facing the country. These tasks, taken together, amount to the improvement of developed socialism.

In Soviet society's life, as Yu. V. Andropov notes, undoubted successes in the fulfillment of many economic, social and cultural tasks of the first phase of communism and the increasingly strong upshoots of the communist future are combined with a number of still-unresolved problems which remain to us from yesterday. The completion of what we have been unable to do before because of objective or subjective factors, the further buildup of the country's material and spiritual potential, the more effective utilization of all socialism's potential and advantages on the basis of the full development of the collectivist principles inherent in it--such, today, is the main content of the activity of party and people.

The decisive direction of all work to improve the developed socialist society has been and remains the upsurge of the economy. The economy is the material basis of our motherland's social and spiritual progress and of the strengthening of its security and international prestige.

Society's requirements and Soviet people's needs grow every year. And in present-day conditions there is only one way to satisfy them--a radical increase in labor productivity and production efficiency on the basis of all-around intensification. We are familiar with its main components: the better utilization of fixed capital, the saving of material and manpower resources in every way, the widespread, rapid introduction of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, the enhancement of the quality of output, a high level of labor organization and discipline. The party has defined precisely the key directions of the national economy's further growth and the enhancement of the people's well-being. They are the fulfillment of the Food Program, the development of the fuel and power complex, machine building, and all sectors that determine scientific and technical progress, the improvement of the work of transport, the expansion of the production and enhancement of the quality of consumer goods, and the development of the service sphere.

Concrete organization and ideological education work is now coming to the fore. This was the aspect to which the May and November 1982 and June 1983 CPSU Central Committee plenums devoted their main attention.

Our party's appeal to work in a more organized way and to strengthen plan, financial, and labor discipline has met with a genuinely nationwide response.

The working people are responding to this appeal with selfless labor and new patriotic initiatives. The movement launched on the Muscovites' initiative under the slogan "Honor and Glory for Labor!" has acquired broad scope.

Positive results can be seen. In the first 6 months of 1983 national economic development indicators improved and the plan was fulfilled in industry by all ministries and union republics. The volume of industrial production increased 4.1 percent and labor productivity 3.3 percent compared with the corresponding period last year. It is very important for every party organization and every labor collective not to slacken its efforts in the struggle for the fulfillment and overfulfillment of national economic plans and pledges

adopted and for organization and discipline at all levels and in all components, and to channel socialist competition above all toward the resolution of tasks in the intensification of production.

The strengthening of discipline and order and the development of socialist competition can only give the proper results when they are combined with the improvement of the entire economic mechanism. Unfortunately our work in this direction, as Yu. V. Andropov has noted, has fallen behind the demands made by the level of material, technical, social and spiritual development achieved by Soviet society. Concrete measures are now being adopted with the aim of ensuring that the economic mechanism secures the optimum combination of the whole people's requirements and the interests of labor collectives and of each worker. Economic conditions must encourage to the full honest, highly productive labor and must make the idle, old-fashioned approach to work disadvantageous and promote a high level of coordination among the components of the national economy. This is an essential condition of increasing our economy's efficiency and developing the masses' labor activeness.

In resolving tasks in this connection, the party devotes priority attention to the consistent application of the principle of distribution according to labor, since it is in this, above all, that the social justice of our system is manifested today. And here there is no more reliable path than that of improving the system of material and moral incentives, strengthening control of the measure of labor and the measure of consumption, and cultivating in every person the requirement for conscientious, creative labor and intolerance of everything that is contrary to our way of life.

The improvement of mature socialism presupposes the further consolidation of the alliance of the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, and the people's intelligentsia while preserving the leading role of the working class, as well as active party influence on the development of the entire system of social class, national, and political relations. We are guided by clear, scientifically substantiated goals. These include the formation of a classless structure of our society within the historical framework of mature socialism. They include the development of socialist statehood and the establishment of ever new forms and methods of implementing the people's power -- a goal served by the recently adopted law on labor collectives. To see and assess realistically the changes that take place in all their complexity, to notice urgent contradictions and problems in good time, and to find ways of resolving them -- that is what is required by life, that is where our party's efforts are concentrated.

Comrades! It is particularly clear today that the fulfillment of economic and social tasks is inconceivable without a substantial improvement in all our ideological, educational, and propaganda activity aimed at molding the new person. After all, the new person is not only the most important aim, but an essential condition of communist building. That is why problems of the party's ideological and mass political work were submitted for discussion at the June plenum of the Central Committee.

It was only natural that the plenum's attention was centered on the question of preparing a new edition of the CPSU program--our main ideological, theoretical and political document. "...In present-day conditions the party program," Yu. V. Andropov stressed in his speech, "must be above all a program for the planned, all-around improvement of developed socialism, and that means of the further advance toward communism" (Yu. V. Andropov, "Izbrannyye Rech'i i Stat'i [Selected Speeches and Articles], Moscow, 1983, p 286). He gave a profound characterization of the main paths of Soviet society's development in the next few years and in the foreseeable future.

Yu. V. Andropov's speech, K. U. Chernenko's report, and the other plenum documents creatively interpret the CPSU's accumulated experience of ideological activity and define its main directions and aims. The plenum set a clear task: that of stepping up all our ideological education work and making it more profound and creative, more in accordance with Soviet people's increased needs and the realities of contemporary life. In a word, it is a question of bringing the content and forms of ideological, theoretical, political education and propaganda work into line with the main content of the party's and the people's activity--the improvement of mature socialism--and with the internal and external conditions in which our development proceeds.

The need for the closest ties between ideological work and the struggle for the fulfillment of key economic and sociopolitical tasks was stressed with full force. Only the merging of ideological education activity with political, organizational, and economic activity produces the necessary effect, ensures the realism, truthfulness, and effectiveness of our propaganda, and helps to overcome such phenomena as alienation from life, formalism, and ostentation.

In the conditions of the exacerbation of the international situation and the frenzied "psychological warfare" unleashed by imperialism--first and foremost American imperialism--against the USSR and the other fraternal countries, particular importance is attached to the further improvement of the working people's class education, the enhancement of political vigilance, and vivid, convincing propaganda of socialism's achievements both in the international arena and at home. It is necessary to firmly rebuff anticommunism and anti-Sovietism and to expose and thwart the class enemy's ideological subversion, relying on a dynamic, effective system of counterpropaganda.

The implementation of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum decisions is the cause of the entire party. It requires of ideological cadres, every party organization, and every communist persistence and purposefulness and boldness in the quest for new forms and methods of work aimed at improving the level of the masses' political awareness and labor activeness.

Comrades! The increasing scale and complexity of the tasks facing the country naturally lead to the further enhancement of the CPSU's leading role. Here nothing is more important for us than to further strengthen its links with the masses and ensure the indestructible unity of party and people (prolonged applause).

Vivid evidence of the Leninist party's steadily strengthening authority and the expansion and deepening of its ties with the masses is provided by the constant growth in the numerical strength and the improvement in the quality of the party's ranks. Whereas in the period of the Second RSDAP Congress party members in Russia numbered only some 3,500 people, by the time of the Great October Socialist Revolution there were 350,000 of them. From a "little seed," as Lenin called the party in the first years of Soviet power, it has now become an 18-million-strong vanguard of fighters for the cause of communism. While preserving and developing its class proletarian nature, the CPSU has become a party of the whole people in the conditions of mature socialism. It is a united, harmonious organization with a very rich arsenal of means of political and ideological influence on all aspects of social life. It is the party at the helm of a mighty socialist state.

The enhancement of the party's combat capability and its influence on social development and on the masses depends to a tremendous extent on the further improvement of the style of party work.

Life demands from party organizations and from every communist a deep understanding of party policy and the ability to approach the resolution of practical tasks in a scientifically substantiated way. You cannot lead successfully without knowing or taking account of the objective laws of economic and social life. This must always be remembered. Ensuring that the interests of the whole people take priority, utilizing all reserves and potential for accelerating our forward movement, ensuring a scientific and businesslike approach, strengthening the monitoring of execution of decisions adopted--these are the most important features of the party leadership style persistently asserted by our Central Committee--the truly Leninist style.

A key component in the party's implementation of its leading role is the selection and placing of cadres. The CPSU has always approached their ideological, political, moral, and practical qualities with the highest yardsticks. Today you cannot be a real leader without displaying the greatest responsibility and organization, discipline and a creative attitude to the task, without ensuring tangible progress in your sector of work. And of course, party organizations are called upon to come out resolutely against any violations of the norms of socialist morality and against inactivity, manifestations of a bureaucratic approach or disregard for the working people's interests, and abuses of official positions.

Improving the style of party leadership means increasing the militancy of primary party organizations as the political nucleus of labor collectives and directing them toward day-to-day work in the thick of the masses. It is necessary to strive persistently for the strict observance of the Leninist norms of party life and to develop intraparty democracy, criticism and self-criticism, initiative, and activeness in every party member.

The CPSU's leading role has nothing in common with command methods or with taking the place of state organs or public organizations. The party fulfills its role on the basis of its highly political prestige and ideological influence among the people, seeking the increasingly full, precise expression of

the working people's vital interests, convincing them of the correctness of its course, and mobilizing them to implement it.

There is no doubt that the tasks facing the party and the entire Soviet people at the modern stage will be successfully resolved. This is guaranteed by the unshakeable cohesion of the CPSU's ranks and by the ideological conviction of communists. It is guaranteed by their ability to lead the people and inspire people with ardent party words. Our system's strength lies in the consciousness of the masses. This strength has always helped us to overcome any difficulties, any obstacles. We rely firmly on it today, too! (Prolonged applause).

3. Party of Internationalists, Party of Peace

Comrades! The RSDWP was born on Russian soil, but it relied on the experience that had been accumulated by that time by the entire international revolutionary movement. The very type of the Bolshevik Party, its program, and its strategy and tactics were established in acute, uncompromising polemics with the opportunist views of the leaders of the Second International. This essentially was Lenin's reply to the question of what not only the Russian but also the entire proletarian movement should do.

At the very beginning of the book "What Is To Be Done?" Lenin placed a brief note, just a few lines long. "Perhaps," he asked, "in this first truly international skirmish with socialist opportunism international revolutionary social democracy will strengthen sufficiently to put an end to political reaction, which has long been reigning in Europe?" (op. cit., vol 6, p 7). At that time not everyone, even among the workers, believed that that time was already close.

But a handful of Russian Marxist internationalists, who had gathered for the Second RSDWP Congress, gave a boost to processes that changed beyond recognition the face of both Russia and the entire world. In the article "On the Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution" V. I. Lenin emphasized: "... We have a right to be proud and we are proud that it has fallen to our happy lot to begin the building of a Soviet state and thereby begin a new epoch in world history, an epoch of the supremacy of a new class, oppressed in all capitalist countries and marching everywhere toward a new life, toward victory over the bourgeoisie, toward dictatorship of the proletariat, and toward mankind's deliverance from the yoke of capital and from imperialist wars" (op. cit., vol 44, p 148). The modern communist movement rose up and was shaped under the direct influence of the October victory and of the bolsheviks' ideas and policy. Leninism became a mighty international political trend of the working class.

The communist movement, an inalienable part of which was and still is the CPSU, has traveled a hard, heroic path. It was born and strengthened in class battles against capital, in which it achieved historic victories. It also knew the bitterness of defeats, which, however, also tempered it and enriched it with new experience. And today the communist movement, which embraces almost 100 equal and independent parties, is a most influential international political force, coming out against imperialism and war and for peace and the peoples' national and social liberation. The real potential of

the communists' consistent struggle for the vital interests of the working class and all working people and against the attempts of opportunists and revisionists to emasculate and distort the revolutionary essence of our great teaching, and the strengthening of the fraternal parties' cohesion on the principles of creative Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Naturally, the CPSU devotes priority attention to deepening and developing fraternal ties with the Marxist-Leninist parties of socialist states. For it is on the scale, the nature, and the very atmosphere of relations among them that the strengthening of our community's unity, the growth of its international prestige, and the successes of socialist building depend to a decisive degree.

Lenin pointed out even before the Great October victory that "the uniting of socialism in one international force" is expressed particularly vividly in the increase in "the number of questions demanding an identical, principled solution in different countries" (op. cit., vol 16, p 67). The almost 40-year development of the world socialist system has confirmed that this is precisely so. The range of similar and common problems that the ruling Marxist-Leninist parties have to resolve is really very wide. And this means that the need to enhance the effectiveness of cooperation among the socialist community countries in all spheres is becoming increasingly pressing. This includes strengthening their political cooperation, moving them to a qualitatively new level of economic integration, and ensuring further ideological rapprochement among the fraternal peoples.

Joint work always goes better when the experience of one becomes the property of all. Each fraternal party of the socialist countries works in its specific conditions. Therefore they have all been and remain in a certain sense pioneers on the path toward socialism and make their own original contribution to the treasurehouse of world revolutionary experience. The skill to make use of it is an indispensable condition for both more successful and more rapid advance toward the common goal. This truth has been tested by time. History, including quite recent history, has convincingly shown something else too. Serious problems, and even crisis situations, arise when the objective law-governed processes of social development are ignored and when the experience accumulated by fraternal parties is mechanically copied or, conversely, is ignored.

The emergence and consolidation of the socialist system has transformed the total appearance of the modern world. The very existence of the socialist communist states, their consistent anti-imperialist policy, and their internationalist solidarity serve as a powerful political and moral support to communist and workers parties in the nonsocialist part of the world. There are today more than 80 such parties. Far from all of them operate legally, and the numbers of their ranks and their influence in their countries' political life are not identical. But through selfless struggle against the oppression of monopolies and the forces of reaction and aggression and on behalf of social progress and a revolutionary transformation of society they are winning over to their side increasingly

broad strata of the working people and are strengthening their positions in the masses.

Soviet people know how difficult this is for fraternal parties. After all, all of them feel the heavy hand of capital on them, which, in some cases by methods of brutal repression, and in others by resort to "constitutional" forms of political and ideological pressure, carries out merciless persecution of communists. It pours out streams of foul lies and slander about our common aims and ideals and tries to undermine the unity of fraternal parties' actions and set them against each other.

Our party well understands and takes account of the diversity and complexity of the conditions in which the communist parties are pursuing the struggle and it builds its relations with them on the basis of equality and mutual respect and trust. It undeviatingly pursues a line of strengthening the cohesion of communist and workers parties, considering that when disagreements do arise on particular questions between individual socialist countries, as well as between some fraternal parties in the world communist movement, it is essential to overcome them on a Marxist-Leninist basis. Faithful to Lenin's behests, the CPSU considers it its primary internationalist duty to develop fraternal cooperation with all Marxist-Leninist parties--our friends and like-minded people (applause).

The CPSU's ties with revolutionary-democratic parties are broadening and strengthening. Their growing influence, their strengthening positions in the anti-imperialist struggle, and the ideological and political rapprochement of many of them with the communist movement are a reflection of those great changes that have taken place and are taking place in Asia, Africa, and Latin America under the influence of the ideas and practice of Leninism. The solidarity of the CPSU and all communists with these parties is a most important condition for expanding and deepening the world revolutionary process.

Comrades! The victory of Great October signified the appearance in the world arena of a state in which all political power was transferred, for the first time in history, into the hands of the working people. This revolutionized international relations. At the same time, it set fundamentally new tasks for the Bolshevik Party. It was necessary to elaborate the theoretical bases on the victorious proletariat's foreign policy, formulate its concrete aims and directions, and embody them in the fabric of practical activity aimed at establishing the Soviet state's international positions. V. I. Lenin made a decisive contribution to the resolution of these tasks (prolonged applause).

Much has changed radically since then in the international arena. The formation of a world socialist system, the appearance out of the ruins of colonialism of dozens of states that take an anti-imperialist stand, and the growth of liberation and antiwar movements have all led to a qualitatively new correlation of social and class forces on a global scale. The potential of Soviet foreign policy has grown immeasurably. But the problems that it has to contend with have also grown more complex. This is particularly clear today as there has been an unprecedented exacerbation of the confrontation between two diametrically opposed world outlooks and two political courses--socialism and imperialism.

The facts convincingly demonstrate that the present U.S. Administration's anticommunist and anti-Soviet policy is the main source of the threat of war. In the grip of militarist fervor it is striving to deploy its new missiles in West Europe and to exploit the arms limitation talks as a screen for its plans for an unrestricted buildup of the means of mass destruction. Washington is trying to throw together a military coalition of the main imperialist powers aimed against the USSR, and other socialist states, and all democratic and progressive forces. It has gambled on achieving U.S. and NATO military superiority over the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries. The response of our party and people and of the fraternal socialist countries is firm and simple: that will not be! (Prolonged applause)

From the very first days after the October Revolution, the Soviet foreign policy line has been based on the fact that it has actively opposed the imperialist policy of diktat and aggression. We do not need war. We were and are the most consistent opponents of the arms race, which places a heavy burden on the peoples, including those in the socialist states. But Soviet people are well aware what imperialism is like and of what monstrous crimes it is capable. Suffice it to recall, for example, the crimes that it is now committing in Central America, the Near East, Africa, and Asia. The latest "crusade" against communism declared by the U.S. President is directed essentially against all forces of peace, freedom, democracy, and progress. Imperialism's immoral and misanthropic policy is particularly dangerous since it proceeds on the basis of the reckless thesis of the "acceptability" of nuclear war.

Our party has done and will continue to do everything to protect the Soviet people and the fraternal countries' peoples against any surprises and any encroachments on socialist gains. We will continue to pay constant attention to improving our illustrious Soviet armed forces and to strengthening the defense capability of the Warsaw Pact--bodies that are firmly guarding peace (applause).

The strength and effectiveness of the CPSU's foreign policy line lies in the fact that it unfailingly follows the course laid down by Lenin and proceeds on the basis of the highest interest of the Soviet people and all working mankind. It relies on a scientific analysis of contemporary world development. Our party's theoretical justification of the conclusions that under present conditions world war is not inevitable and that the policy of peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems is the only rational alternative to nuclear catastrophe is of tremendous significance. Practice has fully confirmed the truth of those conclusions that were vividly embodied in the Peace Program for the 1980s put forward by the 26th CPSU Congress.

Our party's approach to international affairs essentially reflects our communist philosophy of peace. It is this philosophy that forms the basis of the constructive proposals put forward recently by the Soviet Union and contained in the speeches of Yu. V. Andropov. They set out an integrated and realistic platform for radically reducing the level of military confrontation, a platform based on the principles of equality and identical security. That is the

prerequisite of the just solution of all immediate international problems by means of talks.

The fraternal countries' communist and workers parties share and support the CPSU's principled foreign policy stance. That was also shown by the meeting of the leaders of the seven socialist community states held in Moscow 1 month ago. That meeting reemphasized our countries' determination not to permit military superiority to be gained over us under any circumstances and to do everything possible to protect and consolidate peace (applause). The calm, balanced tone of the joint statement and its constructive character are further weighty evidence of the fact that the fraternal countries steadfastly oppose competition in the nuclear arms sphere and all military rivalry. "They are firmly convinced," this document notes, "that no world problems, including the historical dispute between socialism and capitalism, can be resolved by military means."

It befell Lenin's party to be the first to blaze the trail toward the victory of socialism. And that makes many things incumbent upon it: After all, it is not enough simply to go forward, it is necessary to go forward with certainty, defending and asserting what is new and advanced. That is how the CPSU does indeed act. In that respect, in dealing with the most complex tasks of building a new society and defending the Soviet people's socialist gains, our party seeks those solutions that fully conform with the interests of world socialism and the communist and workers movement and with the vital interests of all mankind.

You can ask a lot from those who have been given a lot, Lenin said more than once. One can say that those words were and remain a distinctive slogan of Lenin's party in its activity in the international arena. Soviet communists understand very well the full measures of the responsibility entrusted to them by history. To be equal to that responsibility means being an internationalist not in words but in deeds. That has always distinguished our party's policy and continues to do so today. That has always served and continues to serve as the source of its rightness and strength and its lofty prestige in the revolutionary movement and among all honest people on our planet (applause).

Comrades!

The great organization of revolutionaries created by V. I. Lenin has a unique and heroic fate. For 80 years it has boldly traveled the virgin lands of history, opening up for mankind new horizons of social progress.

The entire revolutionary-transforming activity of the CPSU and the Soviet people is imbued with very broad social creativity. It is based on a knowledge of the objective laws of society's development and on a scientific approach to reality. Marxism-Leninism--that is our party's invincible weapon. The immortal teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin ensures the clarity of the aims put forward by the party and the effectiveness of the means of achieving them. It is that teaching that is the source of our party's innate sense of perspective, without which socialist society cannot successfully develop.

The Soviet people look to the future with confidence and wholly trust the party of communists, the party of social optimism. That optimism is engendered by the Soviet land's entire history, an awareness of our strength and of the correctness of the chosen path. We are loyal to bolshevism because it, by deeds, has proved its indomitable spiritual, organizational and creative power and its ability to set an example of victorious revolutionary strategy and tactics in the struggle for the emancipation of labor, for the transformation of society on just, socialist principles, and for peace and life on earth (prolonged applause).

May the great truth of the age--the truth of Leninist communists, the truth of peace and socialism--live on in the achievements of the Soviet people and echo in the hearts of more and more millions of people!

Long live the CPSU--the party of the great Lenin! (Tumultuous, prolonged applause)

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

CSO: 1802/18

PEACE, THE WORKING CLASS AND THE COMMUNISTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83) pp 19-29

[Text] Today nations throughout the world are concerned with the fate of peace. The source of the threat hanging over mankind is well-known. It is the most aggressive circles of the exploiting society, American imperialism above all, stubbornly pushing mankind toward the brink of nuclear catastrophe.

What are the reasons for such a policy, justifiably described as a policy of nuclear madness? What forces are opposing it and, above all, what could and should they do?

The increased aggressiveness and political adventurism of the imperialist circles is a reflection of the profound processes currently taking place in the world.

The final quarter of the 20th century is a period of unparalleled aggravation of the universal crisis of capitalism and its most profound socioeconomic upheavals, cyclical and structural, unusual rate of unemployment and unparalleled inflation, trade and currency discord among the imperialist countries themselves and their irreconcilable conflicts with liberated countries. As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov pointed out at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "Imperialism has become entangled in domestic and international antagonisms, upheavals and conflicts."

The main antagonism of our age--the antagonism between socialism and imperialism--has become exceptionally grave. The socialist world, which accounts for about one-third of the earth's population, has already reached the level of the largest capitalist countries in terms of a number of economic and scientific and technical parameters. Approximate military potential parity has become obvious. The aggressiveness of the obsolete social system is becoming particularly fierce under these circumstances, and the efforts to resolve its crisis problems through "force" are becoming increasingly frequent.

Understandable in this connection is the sinister role of the military-industrial complexes (MIC) in the imperialist countries, which have either seized or are currently seizing the key power levers. Until quite recently the arms manufacturers were not able to impose their will on the individual countries and to dictate market conditions on such a scale and so aggressively.

The militaristic boom is turning into a "gold mine" for the arms manufacturing corporations. However, matters are not reduced to this alone. Those who are developing the Pershing, Trident and Tomahawk missiles are determining today also the "big politics" of the imperialist West. As the French *LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE* noted, talks on "the threat to the United States from the outside intensifies precisely when the government contract with one company or another is about to expire. This threat makes it absolutely necessary to develop a new type of weapon which, apparently 'accidentally,' coincides with the design already developed by the company."

The representatives and ideologues of the military-industrial complex frequently support the fabrication of the "Soviet military threat" with references to the adverse socioeconomic consequences which a refusal to continue the arms race might have. They present militaristic measures as boosters of scientific and technical progress, incentives for economic developments and factors of social stability.

What have decades of "hot" and "cold" wars proved? The fact is that military boosters can only serve as a drug, i.e., contribute to a temporary enlivenment of several economic sectors. The bankruptcy of prescriptions of "blossoming through rearmament" became particularly clear during the last decade. Unquestionably, militarism accelerated the crisis of the entire system of state-monopoly economic control.

Particularly dangerous from the viewpoint of the interests of the working people, the working class above all, among the various arguments in favor of the arms race is the claim that reducing war production is fraught with increased unemployment. However, estimates uncontroversially prove that investments in civilian sectors create 50 to 100 percent more jobs than in the arms race. Something else is characteristic as well: before the intensified arms race was started there was virtually no unemployment in the FRG, whereas in the United States, as the militaristic boom developed, unemployment rose from 7 to 10 percent or more according to official and obviously understated figures--a record for the past more than 40 years.

Contemporary trends and changes in the structure of military expenditures also intensify the negative effect of their impact on employment. The increased role of outlays for most complex and capital-intensive armaments--heavy bombers, intercontinental missiles and electronic systems--proportionally provide a diminishing number of jobs. Above all, the arms race worsens the employment problem because of the resulting overall slowdown in the pace of economic growth.

The arms race triggers many other adverse socioeconomic phenomena. Militarization is the principal "motor" of inflation, which substantially lowers the living standard of the working people. Increased military expenditures usually entail higher taxes and lowered appropriations for social needs. Under the Reagan administration, which has mounted a real offensive against social programs, such appropriations have already been substantially curtailed and further cuts are planned for the immediate future.

Not only the catastrophic consequences of a possible war but the adverse results of war preparations, i.e., the impossibility of resolving the crisis problems of capitalism through militaristic means, are becoming increasingly obvious to the broad popular masses.

The antagonism between socialism and imperialism--the key antagonism of our age--is assuming today a new, very important form of expression. It is developing into a global confrontation between the forces of imperialism and the interests of all mankind. This creates objective prerequisites for the frontal rejection of imperialist aggression. It is a question of saving life on our planet and harnessing all resources for the solution of this problem and, with it, the number of urgent problems which face mankind as a whole and each country individually.

The unprecedented upsurge of the antiwar movement throughout the world is becoming an expression of the universal aspiration of mankind toward peace and the prevention of a thermonuclear catastrophe and, above all, of a new round in the arms race. At the June session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, A. A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR minister of foreign affairs, justifiably described this movement as a "kind of popular referendum."

The mass character of antiwar activities is intensifying. Last spring hundreds of thousands of citizens in many countries took to the streets with antiwar slogans. In 1982 alone a 400,000-strong demonstration took place in Bonn; 250,000 British marched in London; and 300,000 took part in an antiwar demonstration in Italy. On 19 June, some 500,000 people attended the "Peace Holiday" in Paris. The ruling circles of the United States as well have faced a tempestuous, expanding antiwar movement. Popular demonstrations spread throughout the Western seaboard in the spring and beginning of the summer of 1983, calling for freezing the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the USSR; "peace camps" and picket lines began to appear, opposing the production of MX, Trident and cruise missiles, B-1 bombers, and so on.

The biggest actions are planned for this autumn. The coordination committee, which was set up in the FRG, and which rallies 26 different organizations, is planning the largest peace demonstration in the country's history within the framework of the United Nations Disarmament Week, in three cities--Hamburg, Bonn and Stuttgart--on 22 October.

Also on 22 October the Austrian peace movement will have its second all-Austrian "peace march" aimed against Pershing and cruise missiles and for the refusal on the part of nuclear powers to use nuclear weapons first. Dozens of antiwar social organizations, including the Austrian socialist and communist parties, will participate in the march.

As planned by the All-National Antiwar Movement Council of The Netherlands, mass antiwar demonstrations will take place in the autumn of 1983, more powerful than those of 1981. A nationwide peace march on Washington under the slogan "Work, Peace and Freedom!" is planned in the United States.

The pointed activities of the contemporary antiwar movement are being aimed increasingly clearly against U.S. nuclear strategy. The supporters of the antiwar movement in Western Europe are discussing specific means to counteract the deployment of American missiles on their territory and the possible use of various forms of resistance such as, for example, strikes, blockades of missile deployment sites, and others. The antiwar movements in the United States and Western Europe are increasingly emphasizing the connection between the nuclear arms race and unemployment and the various aspects of the gravest socioeconomic crisis experienced by Western society.

Reality itself has demanded of the contemporary antiwar movement that it increase the coordination of its activities on an international scale. The Prague Assembly "For Peace and Life and Against Nuclear War" which took place from 21 to 26 June and was attended by more than 3,000 participants has become the most representative forum of its kind. Of late such coordination has been intensifying on both sides of the Atlantic. Supporters of a nuclear freeze in the United States agree with the antimissile protest in Western Europe and firmly oppose the deployment of new American nuclear missiles there. At the same time, the idea of nuclear freeze referenda is steadily becoming more popular in a number of Western European countries.

The social and political supporters of the antiwar movement confirm its extent and growing ability to have a major influence on political and military-strategic decisions made in one Western country or another.

The antiwar organizations which appeared during the period of the war in Vietnam and pacifist groups play an important role in the ranks of the movement. Social and professional groups, such as physicians, scientists and men of culture and the arts, are becoming increasingly active in the struggle for peace in the national and international arenas.

Today the threat of war is being realized also by an increasing number of members of the ruling class, particularly groups which are directly interested in the development of trade and economic relations with the socialist countries and which suffer most from the unrestrained militarization of the Western economy. Groups of businessmen for peace, supporting the antiwar movement, are appearing. A number of other members of the ruling circles in the capitalist countries, such as political personalities, the military, including members of the general staff, are also assuming antimilitaristic positions. Some of them, such as Generals H. Bastian and N. Pasti, and Admirals A. Sanginetti and J. Laroque, are active in the antiwar movements in their respective countries.

In reacting to the feelings of the masses, the religious organizations are beginning to play an increasing role in the struggle for peace. The Protestant churches in The Netherlands, the FRG, the Scandinavian countries and Great Britain, the National Council of Christian Churches in the United States, and the Roman Catholic churches in a number of Western European countries and the United States are coming out against the nuclear war and the arms race. The antiwar pastoral letters to the faithful, drafted by U.S. and FRG Roman Catholic bishops, met with a wide response.

The scope of the antiwar protest is also affecting governmental structures in the Western countries. Not dozens but hundreds of municipalities in Great Britain, the FRG, Belgium, The Netherlands and other countries have proclaimed themselves nuclear-free zones.

The working class is raising its voice increasingly loudly against militarism of late. This is no accident.

In their active struggle for the prevention of a global thermonuclear war, the working class and its communist vanguard are guided by humanistic principles and confidence in the possibility of building a society without arms and wars. Marx said that "the unification of the working class in the various countries should, in the final account, make wars among nations impossible" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 16, p 556).

Today the working class is a great social force at the center of the contemporary historical age. It is determining the main direction of global social developments.

By virtue of its very nature the working class is objectively interested in the preservation and strengthening of peace and security of the nations and the prevention of aggressive wars, the more so since imperialism is taking the world not merely to the next war but to a nuclear war, which would undermine the very foundations of human life on earth and human civilization.

By themselves the imperialist preparations for war and the arms race radically clash with the immediate and long-term interests of the workers and all working people.

They present to the working class in the socialist countries substantial difficulties in building or advancing socialism and creating prerequisites for a transition to communism. In the capitalist countries, the arms race and the military psychosis lead to a decline in the living standard of the working people, hinder the growth of the political consciousness of the working class, strengthen the positions of the reaction and promote feelings of nationalism and chauvinism, thus weakening the struggle for true democracy and social progress. The aggravation of international tension and the involvement of these countries in the arms race bring the working class and the working people in the liberated countries the preservation of poverty and backwardness, hunger and disease. They intensify their dependence on imperialism and hinder their socioeconomic and political development. The objective interest of the workers in all countries in the creation of a just and humane society makes the international working class a firm and consistent fighter for peace among nations and an opponent of aggressive wars and the arms race.

The working class and its organizations rely in the struggle for peace and security of the peoples on the rich historical experience and great combat traditions of the revolutionary proletarian movement which, from the time of its appearance, has systematically supported antiwar and anti-imperialist positions. The Great October Socialist Revolution marked a transition in the struggle against militarism and opened essentially new opportunities for resolving the problem of war and peace by a state organized by the working

class. Contrary to imperialist international policy, the victorious proletariat was the first to formulate and to defend a foreign policy course of a new type, which reflected the international interests of the working people of all countries and their interest in the preservation of peace.

Taking up and creatively developing the experience in the antimilitaristic struggle, acquired by the revolutionary movement, and firmly rejecting the opportunistic policy of the leadership of the Second International, the Third Communist International raised high the Leninist banner of peace among nations. Its very first congress set the working class the world over the most important international task of "making wars impossible." The Comintern, which raised at its Seventh Congress the slogan of the struggle for peace as the main one, made a considerable contribution to mobilizing the international working class in the struggle against preparations for a worldwide slaughter and against fascism in the course of the war it had already unleashed.

In the postwar years, when real conditions for the prevention of world wars appeared for the first time in history with the formation of the world socialist system, the antiwar struggle entered a new stage.

Increased attention to safeguarding peace is becoming a characteristic feature of the worker movement today.

Trade unions in the Western European countries are increasing their activities in the defense of peace and against the deployment of American nuclear missiles. This is confirmed by the results of the congresses held in 1982 and the first half of 1983 of large and influential trade union organizations such as the French General Confederation of Labor, the British Trade Unions Congress, the United German Trade Unions (FRG), the General Confederation of Portuguese Working People--the National Intersindical--and others the resolutions adopted at a number of international forums such as, for example, the May 1983 international conference "Trade Unions of the World in the Struggle Against Chemical and Bacteriological Weapons."

New forms of antiwar actions are developing within the trade union movement. In 1982, on the appeal of the Tenth World Trade Union Congress, for the first time a Day of Trade Union Actions for Peace was celebrated on 1 September--the anniversary of the outbreak of World War II. The International Trade Union Committee for Peace and Disarmament, which was set up in Dublin in 1982, as the coordinating center in the antiwar struggle waged by the working people, including the organization of specific activities and scientific research and interacting with the other social forces of the fighters for peace, made a substantial contribution to the preparations and holding of it. The meeting among representatives of trade unions (Prague, June 1983), at which topical problems of the antimilitaristic struggle were discussed, such as the activities of worker organizations against the deployment of new missiles in Western Europe and the interconnection between these actions and the struggle against the policy of the military-industrial complex and the multinational corporations, the arms race and its socioeconomic aspects, and the increased influence of the working people on the development of economic relations between East and West, took place on the initiative of this committee,

within the framework of the world "For Peace and Life and Against Nuclear War" assembly. The next meeting of the "Trade Unions and Peace" will take place in Bulgaria in October 1983.

Many working people's organizations in Asia, Africa and Latin America, such as the Standing Trade Union Unity Congress of Working People in Latin America and the Organization of African Trade Union Unity, which oppose the arms race and favor the isolation of dictatorial, fascist and racist regimes and the development of cooperation among countries based on the principles of peaceful coexistence, are developing antiwar activities.

Despite the current scope of the antiwar movement and the increased role and activeness of the working class within it, a large number of working people and their organizations are still outside its ranks. This is explained, in particular by the fact that the antiwar struggle is developing under the conditions of a drastically intensified ideological pressure exerted by the monopolies and the bourgeois state, combined with the repressive measures they take against the fighters for peace. The propaganda apparatus of the rearmament supporters is intensively promoting within the labor movement the "idea" to the effect that a policy "from a position of strength" is a guarantee for the prevention of war and that the arms race is just about the only reliable means for resolving the employment problem. Anti-Sovietism, promoted among the toiling masses by the bourgeois information media, draws their attention away from the real source of the threat of war.

The positions taken by a number of working people's organizations headed by reactionary anticommunist leaders are particularly damaging to the effectiveness of the antiwar movement. In some cases, the leadership of such organizations (such as the executive committee of the AFL-CIO in the United States) is openly in favor of increasing military expenditures and openly approves the aggressive imperialist course. In others (such as the leadership of the French Force Ouvriere Trade Union Movement) it tries to promote a split in the antiwar movement by holding the socialist countries responsible for increased tension and conflicts.

Although the international reformist trade unions have spoken out increasingly clearly of late in favor of detente and against the arms race (as they did at the 13th Congress of the International Federation of Free Trade Unions, in June 1983), the leaders oppose unity of action and cooperation among worker organizations of different persuasions. As a result, the organizations affiliated with the three basic international trade union centers, although holding very similar or even coinciding positions, act on an isolated and separate basis. This seriously weakens the antiwar struggle and hinders the mobilization of the broad toiling masses in their joint opposition to the militaristic course of the imperialist countries.

The present circumstances in the world urgently demand of all detachments of the labor movement further new efforts for the elimination of the threat of world war and the salvation of human civilization. The communists bear particular responsibility in the solution of these problems. As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, pointed out at the June

1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "the threat of nuclear war urges us to reassess the basic meaning of the activities of the entire communist movement. The communists have always fought the oppression and exploitation of man by man. Today they are struggling also for the preservation of human civilization and the human right to life."

Lenin wrote that "the socialists have always condemned wars among nations as barbaric and beastly" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 26, p 311). He repeatedly emphasized this view before and after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. On 28 June 1918, addressing a worker meeting, he said that war is, in general, contrary to the aspirations of the communist parties. The communists have repeatedly confirmed their loyalty to this principle. Today they set themselves the task of making the masses aware of the true origins of the threat of war as they describe the nature of the initiative and constructive proposals made by the Soviet Union and the socialist commonwealth. They show the antipeople's nature of the nuclear arms race and expose the false claims of imperialist propaganda of the "Soviet military threat," "Soviet military superiority," and so on. The communists explain the groundlessness and danger of the concept of the "two superpowers," and the allegedly equal responsibility of the USSR and the United States for increased international tension and the arms race.

Thus, the West German communists exposed the intention of the FRG government to pursue the escalation of the arms race and, together with the Reagan administration, implement NATO's nuclear missile resolutions. The German Communist Party takes into consideration the concern expressed by the broadest possible circles to the effect that the deployment of new American missiles in the FRG will create a situation which, the official declarations of the FRG government notwithstanding, may initiate a world war from its territory.

The French Communist Party has formulated a number of important initiatives. In May 1982 it turned to the members of the Second Special UN General Assembly Disarmament Session with the suggestion that it adopt a comprehensive disarmament program and support all talks on problems related to general disarmament, reduction of armament stockpiles, or partial measures in that direction. They spoke out in favor of convening a European conference on measures for strengthening trust and security and promoting disarmament in Europe, the ratification of all treaties related to banning various types of mass destruction weapons, total ban of nuclear tests and non-first use of nuclear weapons. A "peace march" with the participation of noted personalities in the antiwar movement was sponsored by the French Communist Party in June 1983. The communist party refutes the thesis of the military superiority of the Soviet Union and considers that the French and British nuclear forces must be taken into consideration in establishing the overall ratio of forces.

The Greek Communist Party ascribes prime importance to the question of the American bases on Greek territory, which it considers a violation of the country's national independence. It explains to the masses the fact that in the struggle for peace the peoples of all countries can and do make their unique contribution by demanding peace, disarmament and detente within their own country.

At their January 1983 conference, the Austrian communists demanded that neutral Austria increase its contribution to detente and disarmament. Last June, the Communist Party of Austria Central Committee Plenum turned to the country's parliament and government with the appeal to oppose the deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

Last May the Swedish Labor Party-Communists held its regular congress under the slogan "Let Us Struggle for Peace and Work!" The congress of the Swiss Communists, which took place at that time as well, was under the slogan "Peace, Freedom, Solidarity, Socialism."

The American communists recognize their particular responsibility in exposing the dangerous and false anti-Soviet and anticommunist propaganda behind which the U.S. imperialists hide their plans. They have called upon the progressive circles in their country to show high vigilance and have earmarked measures to increase the efficiency of their ideological work among the broad popular masses, above all for the sake of continuing to expose the great imperialist lie regarding the "Soviet threat."

In dozens of countries the communists realize that peace can be preserved and strengthened if the peace-loving forces on earth can assume control over the development of contemporary international life.

What is the base of the peace philosophy of the communist and worker parties? It is founded on the understanding of the catastrophic consequences of a thermonuclear war today, and the firm conviction that the victory of socialism does not need war. It is based on the sober analysis on the ratio of forces in the world arena, which offers a real opportunity for preventing war as a result of the united efforts of the socialist countries, the international labor movement and all peaceloving countries and nations.

It is no secret that initially some comrades showed a certain lack of understanding of the nature of antiwar movements, regardless of the variety of their structure and ideological concepts; they were not always able to surmount their prejudice toward a number of pacifist and ecological organizations, whose positions are inconsistent and conflicting. They were unable to see in the participants in these movements their objective allies in the struggle for peace.

In the majority of cases, however, such underestimating has been surmounted. The communist parties are doing everything possible to develop the struggle of the masses against the threat of war. They encourage cooperation among heterogeneous political and social forces worried by the threat of war.

While considering their active participation in such movements as the most important means for strengthening ties with the masses and increasing their influence among them, the communist parties do not seek any personal advantages. They pursue no self-seeking objectives but deem it their duty to act within their ranks, respecting the specific features of the individual movements, with a view to ensuring the further strengthening of the mass movement for peace and disarmament developing on their basis.

In participating in such movements, the communists point out their weaknesses and difficulties and make their contribution toward their elimination. They point out that awareness of the threat hanging over mankind is rising for the time being less rapidly than the threat itself and firmly oppose all attempts at dividing the supporters of peace and using the ideas of peace for counter-revolutionary objectives and against socialism.

Taking the still-insufficient activeness of the working class in the antiwar movements into consideration, the communists are intensifying their activities at enterprises and trade unions. They identify the direct contact between the struggle for peace and the solution of imminent socioeconomic problems and relate their activities in antiwar movements to the tactic of the struggle for broad social and political alliances. It is on this level that the task of uniting on a common platform all antiwar movements is formulated.

The possibilities of preventing a new world war and preserving and consolidating peace largely depend on the positions of the social democratic movement. Despite its inconsistency and contradictory nature of its foreign policy positions, during the 1970s the social democratic movement made a constructive contribution to detente. It contributed to the implementation of the principles of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems. In the present drastically worsened global situation, the social democrats continue to consider the course of detente a permanent task and believe that there is "no sensible alternative" to it.

This is confirmed, among others, by the results of the 16th Socialist International Congress, which was held in April of 1983, the resolutions of which emphasize that the most essential task is to ensure the survival of mankind.

However, the assessment of the basic reasons for the worsening of the foreign policy climate made by the social democratic leadership is frequently quite unobjective and bears the anticommunist seal. The leadership of the social democratic movement still frequently interprets the problem of war and peace as the result of the rivalry between the "two superpowers." To this day the various social democratic parties of NATO countries proclaim their "loyalty to Atlantic solidarity." However, their positions frequently indicate a growing feeling of responsibility and concern for the fate of civilization and a gradual awareness of the fact that the "threat to Europe" comes not from the USSR but from the militaristic aspirations of the American administration. Today increasingly broad international social democratic circles are beginning to understand with increasing clarity the danger of steps which could worsen the situation in the world and lead to the growth of armaments.

Of late the social democrats in a number of countries have shown a trend of cooperating with related trade unions in matters of counteracting the threat of war. The aspiration for such a cooperation in the struggle against unemployment and for peace and disarmament is particularly noticeable in northern Europe, where, for the first time in many years, representatives of social democratic parties and trade union associations in Finland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark drafted a common platform on problems of peace and disarmament at their February 1983 conference.

Therefore, despite their entire contradictory and inconsistent antiwar positions, the social democrats are opening many opportunities for the implementation of a number of practical measures aimed at preventing the arms race and a new war and preserving peace.

In their struggle for the all-round widening and strengthening of the international antiwar front, the communists ascribe an essential and increasing significance to the active participation of the various forces of the national liberation movement in it. Since the preservation of peace today is a problem which affects the interests of all countries and nations, the communists proceed from the fact that the liberated countries are vitally interested in detente and the development of an efficient international security system. The military crises which have broken out in that part of the world have frequently threatened to become explosions of a global nature.

The arms race puts a particularly heavy burden on the economy of the young countries. Meanwhile, the military expenditures of these countries are continuing to grow (by a factor of almost 2.5 between 1972 and 1981), as is their share in global military expenditures (from 10 to 19 percent during the same period).

Imperialism and the selfish and predatory policies of the largest monopolies bear full responsibility for the instability and explosive situation of the Afro-Asian and Latin American areas. That is why the understanding of the peoples of the liberated countries of the importance of an active struggle for peace is strengthening in close interconnection with the solution of all other problems related to their social progress.

This trend, which is of vital importance to the peoples of the developing countries and the cause of universal peace, was convincingly confirmed at the Seventh Conference of Heads of States and Governments of Nonaligned Countries, which was held last spring in New Delhi, the Indian capital.

Today as in the past the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, which are at the front lines of the antiwar struggle, are the largest force for peace. In asserting the principled support of universal peace by the communists and the entire Soviet people, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said that "the Soviet Union will do everything it can to ensure a tranquil, peaceful future for the present and future generations. This is our political objective from which we will not retreat."

The CPSU policy in the international arena is firmly based on the Marxist-Leninist philosophy of peace. Marx and Engels inscribed forever on the banners of communism the combined lofty objectives of the working class: to promote the triumph of labor and peace. In developing their ideas, Lenin saw the radical advantage of socialism as a social system and the fact that it brings to the peoples of the world salvation from the age-old threat of war.

The basic feature of the communist philosophy of peace is that it is also a philosophy of social progress. The peoples throughout the earth want the preservation of universal peace. This today is the main thing, without which the social progress of the nations is inconceivable. However, the nations cannot fail to consider whether or not it would contribute to the progressive and democratic development of all nations. For this reason, our philosophy

of peace has a class nature. It proceeds from the fact that, in the final account, the firm guarantees for peace are related to the progressive and democratic structure of all countries. While consistently fighting for peace and formulating this task as the focal point of all of their activities, the communists defend the interests and will of the working class and the profound interests and will of all nations on earth.

However, formulating lofty objectives in the struggle for strengthening peace is insufficient. It is important to see the real ways in the struggle for the preservation of peace under the present exceptionally worsened international conditions. We see them in restricting the arms race, total ban of nuclear weapons and, in the final account, universal and total disarmament. This approach was formulated by Lenin during the first years of the Soviet system, when a program for universal and total disarmament was presented. Lenin pointed out that "disarmament is the socialist ideal" (op. cit., vol 30, p 152). It is no accident that it is precisely our country which is formulating suggestions and initiatives aimed at terminating the arms race and promoting disarmament. Our arsenal includes suggestions on universal and total disarmament, universal and total control, universal and total banning of nuclear weapon tests, limiting the sale and delivery of conventional armaments to other countries, freezing nuclear weapons, quantitatively and qualitatively, and limiting nuclear armaments in Europe. It was precisely the Soviet Union which solemnly proclaimed that it will never be the first to use nuclear weapons, a step which was properly assessed by anyone caring for peace on earth.

The materials and decisions of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, USSR Supreme Soviet session and speeches by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov are a new contribution to the constructive solution of the topical problems of contemporary international relations.

The joint declaration adopted at the recently held meeting of party and state leaders of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the USSR and Czechoslovakia is a document of major political significance. The participants in the meeting turned to the NATO countries and to the rest of the world with the urgent appeal to weigh soberly and objectively threatening trends in the development of international relations and draw sensible conclusions consistent with the most profound interests of mankind. The participants in the meeting gave a clear and extensive answer to the question of how to safeguard peace. The peaceful initiatives of the socialist countries were developed further at the Moscow meeting. The results of that meeting reconfirm that today it is precisely socialism which is the most consistent defender of the healthy principles in international relations and the interests of detente and peace, as well as those of each nation and all mankind.

We are ready to engage in a constructive dialogue with all antiwar movements and to seek common positions in the struggle for the prevention of thermonuclear war, the restoration and strengthening of detente and disarmament. Openly proclaiming their philosophical and political positions on problems of war and peace, the communists are ready to exchange views with all participants in the antiwar movements and to take their viewpoints into consideration in the interest of the common cause of peace. The joint efforts of all peace-loving countries, nations and movements alone can strengthen peace on earth and prevent a fatal thermonuclear catastrophe.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

KARL MARX AND FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS OF AESTHETICS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83) pp 30-40

[Article by Prof M. Ovsyannikov, doctor of philosophical sciences]

[Text] The Great October Revolution inaugurated a new stage in the development of world artistic and aesthetic culture. We can boldly say that in the entire history of the artistic development of mankind no richer phenomenon from the ideological-aesthetic viewpoint or a more comprehensive and polychromatic event than the culture of the Soviet Union has ever occurred. "The single international culture of the Soviet Union, which serves all working people and expresses their common ideals, is growing and strengthening on the fertile soil of mature socialism," we read in the CPSU Central Committee decree on the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR. "It encompasses everything of universal significance in the achievements and original traditions of national cultures. Socialist in content and varied in national forms and internationalist in spirit and nature, Soviet culture has become a great force in the ideological and moral unification of nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union."

The art and literature of socialist society have justifiably earned global recognition. The new social relations which developed as a result of the revolutionary transformations made by the Soviet people under the guidance of the Leninist party are the vivifying source which nurtures the development of socialist artistic culture. The invincible power of the art of socialist realism is closely related to the life of the toiling masses, its humanistic nature and the great problems of the age. Soviet art owes its great successes to the wise policy of our party which has invariably guided the activities of the creative workers in mastering above all the socially significant problems and creating works imbued with the ideas of socialism.

One of the most important characteristics of the party's policy in artistic-aesthetic culture is the fact that it is based on the solid foundations of Marxist-Leninist theory of culture and aesthetics, the general philosophical foundations for which are dialectical and historical materialism. On the basis of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, for the first time aesthetics and the study of literature and art gained the possibility of explaining on a strictly scientific basis the nature and laws governing the development and functioning of the artistic and aesthetic culture of society and the nature of aesthetic creativity and consciousness. The appearance of Marxist aesthetics constituted a revolutionary turn in the history of world aesthetic thinking.

Marx made this change together with F. Engels, his friend and fellow worker. All progressive mankind is celebrating this year the 165th anniversary of the birth and centennial of the death of K. Marx, the founder of scientific communism. "One hundred years have passed since the death of a man named Karl Marx," wrote Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary. "An entire century. It was a century of dramatic upheavals, revolutionary storms and radical changes in the destinies of mankind. It was a century which swept off a number of philosophical concepts, social theories and political doctrines. It was a century of one victory of Marxism after another and of its growing impact on social progress."

Marx's aesthetic concept is merely a part of his philosophical theory. In formulating the foundations of dialectical-materialistic aesthetics, on the one hand, he relied on the achievements of world progressive aesthetic thinking; on the other, on the profound study of the art of previous ages. He spent a great deal of time since his adolescence studying the cultural masterpieces of all times and nations. Marx was perfectly familiar with such ancient authors as Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripedes, Virgil, and Lucretius, and the outstanding medieval poets and writers. He highly valued the writers of the Renaissance, Shakespeare and Cervantes above all, the Italian poets and the greatest cultural personalities of the 18th and 19th centuries, such as Diderot, Rousseau, Goethe, Schiller, Walter Scott, Dickens and Thackeray. He made a thorough study of graphic arts from ancient times to the 19th century. In a word, no single significant phenomenon of ancient and modern artistic culture escaped his attention. Marx, therefore, had at his disposal tremendous factual data based on artistic practice, which he needed for his philosophical-aesthetic summations.

Let us note an exceptionally important feature in Marx's aesthetics. Always and under all circumstances the development of his aesthetic theory was based on a profound knowledge of artistic practice. In other words, aesthetic theory never became nor could become a closed circle of philosophical reflection, for Marx's ideological, political and artistic aesthetic ties were related to the tempestuous conflicts of the century.

The great revolutionary made a profound study of ancient and modern aesthetics. He was well-familiar with the works of Plato, Aristotle and the Epicureans. He showed a tremendous amount of interest in German aesthetics. The works of Kant, Lessing, Winkelman, Herder, Goethe, Schiller and Solger and the romantics were studied by him most thoroughly. The young Marx was working on a "Treatise on Christian Art," in which connection he studied the works of the German art experts Bettiger, Grund, and Rumor. He studied particularly closely Hegel's "Aesthetics."

Marx summed up Theodore Fischer's "Aesthetics." As we know, this work by the German Hegelian was subsequently thoroughly criticized by N. G. Chernyshevskiy. In itself, Fischer's book is of no particular interest. The content of the treatise shows the direction which was followed by bourgeois German aesthetics after the defeat of the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany. The listing toward subjective idealism is the characteristic feature of German bourgeois aesthetics of that period. Marx's excerpts from Fischer's works and his comments are of invaluable importance, for they enable us to see the unabated

interest which the great proletarian philosopher had in problems of aesthetics. At the same time, they clarify the direction which was followed by Marx's thinking itself in the study of basic aesthetic concepts.

We also find interesting the fact that Marx dealt with poetry as well. M. Lifschitz, the author of a series of works on this topic, who studied Marx's aesthetic legacy, proved that the poetry of the great philosopher has unquestionable poetic merits, although the author himself referred to his literary efforts in a semi-jocular manner. It is unquestionable, however, that the great scientists and revolutionaries had excellent aesthetic taste. This is particularly noteworthy and has been reflected in Marx's works in which he acts not only as a philosopher and aesthetician but as an art critic as well.

One of Marx's outstanding merits is that, together with Engels, he developed the most important methodological principles of scientific research, which are the essence of dialectics.

A variety of "approaches" to the scientific study of social phenomena have become widespread of late, including art (such as semiotic, structural, informational, psychological, etc.). What is worrisome is not the use of such specific methods but their universalization. For example, the absolutizing of the semiotic "approach" invariably leads to neglecting the graphic nature of art and, naturally, of artistic imagination. The structural approach focuses the attention on the study of the structural elements of artistic culture of individual works of art, ignoring the link between artistic phenomena and the comprehensive aspects of social life. The informational "approach" exaggerates the significance of quantitative criteria in the assessment of works of art. The psychological "approach" has shortcomings as well, for it leads to neglecting the most essential aspect of a work of art--its cognitive potential. Today our aesthetics is noted by a significant sober attitude toward methodological innovations. Practical experience has confirmed that ascribing a universal significance to such individual methods is fraught with the distortion of the truth and one-sidedness in the study of complex phenomena such as art. The dialectical method alone saves us from one-sidedness and stultification, for it has at its disposal an entire system of laws and categories which enable us to study the object from various sides in its dynamic process, in accordance with internal contradictions and motive forces governing the development of a given phenomenon. Therefore, the dialectics, as the general theory of development, was and remains the most effective method in the study of natural and social phenomena. Let us note that said "new approaches" in aesthetic research have existed in one way or another in pre-Marxist philosophy as well. In the development of the dialectical method, Marx had such "approaches" in mind, realizing their limitations. Like philosophy, in resolving its problems, one way or another aesthetics used individual concepts and the conceptual apparatus and means of research of other sciences, both humanitarian and natural. This is a legitimate process of integration of knowledge which must be taken into consideration. However, this integration process demands a serious methodological analysis from the viewpoints of dialectical materialist philosophy. Such was Marx's train of thought.

The further development of scientific research proved that Marx was absolutely right. On the one hand, he emphasized the need to use the data of specific sciences in philosophical research. On the other, he noted the specific nature of philosophical methodology, which should not be identified with any specific approach used in the individual sciences which, in turn, cannot develop fruitfully unless based on a truly scientific methodology. In this case Marx had in mind the method of dialectical materialism.

It is symptomatic that Marxist methodology and the Marxist dialectical method are beginning to draw increasingly the attention of even bourgeois philosophers who have hardly anything to do with Marxism. Contemporary bourgeois methodology has entered a period of profound crisis. The methodological pluralism which has developed in bourgeois philosophy confirms not its wealth but precisely its paucity and crisis. This explains the fact that Marxism, particularly its philosophical-methodological aspect, has become today a subject of close study and, sometimes, is positively rated even by bourgeois scientists who, by virtue of class limitations or hostility, are unable to accept it as the conceptual foundation of their studies.

In recent years Soviet social scientists have focused their efforts on the development of the most important problems of the theory and methodology of social knowledge. Controversial problems in defining methods and studies of the correlation between theory and methodology, determining the role of the outlook and characterizing the level of methodology, and so on, have become more clearly apparent. Let us emphasize in this connection that methodology is the most important structural component of Marxist philosophy and that the ideas formulated by the leader of the world proletariat retain their exceptional relevance. In such matters we cannot make a single step forward without turning to the "prime sources," i.e., to the ideas of the founders of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. This directly applies to the methodology of aesthetic research.

One of Marx's great merits is that he was the first to discover the objective laws governing social development. The dialectical idea of historicism is the most important concept in his methodology. It is in this sense that we must understand the statement made by Marx and Engels to the effect that we know only a single science, the science of history. Its objective is to study the development of nature, society and thinking as a single, interrelated and natural process. To Marx the history of society is the continuation of a history of nature. At the same time, however, he did not in the least identify natural with social laws, which is frequently the case in contemporary bourgeois sociology and the study of art and aesthetics. According to Marx, there are general and specific laws. The task of science is, precisely, to study nature and society, bearing in mind their common features and specific characteristics.

Quite important in aesthetics is the problem of aesthetic awareness. Marx did not consider it in the least part of a natural human characteristic, although some bourgeois aestheticians precisely followed in this direction.

Aesthetic consciousness to Marx is a social phenomenon. The term "mastery" was extensively used by Hegel, who had borrowed it in turn from the law. To Hegel, the Idealist, "mastery" meant determining the identity between thinking and existence. To Marx mastery meant, first of all, the study of the subject and, secondly, changing it in accordance with the objectives and requirements of man. In this sense Marx's interpretation of human labor activities is of great importance. According to him, labor was a process taking place between nature and man, a process in which through his activities man determines, controls and regulates the exchange between himself and nature. In a work written as early as 1844, Marx analyzed from the aesthetic viewpoint man's labor, radically different from labor-like activities of animals. Bearing in mind the importance of the thoughts he developed, we must quote a long citation. Marx wrote: "It is true that the animal as well produces. It builds its nest or home, as do bees, beavers, ants, and so on. However, the animal produces only that which meets its immediate requirements or that of its offspring. It produces one-sidedly, whereas man produces universally; it produces only under the drive of immediate physical requirements, whereas man produces also when he is free from physical need and, in the true meaning of the word, only when he is free from need; an animal produces only for itself, whereas man reproduces all nature; the product of the animal is directly related to its physical organism, whereas man can freely oppose its product. An animal builds only in accordance with the extent and need of the species to which it belongs, whereas man can produce according to the measures of any species, for which reason he knows how to apply the specific measure to that subject; by virtue of this man can also build in accordance with the laws of beauty" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 42, pp 93-94).

As we can see, Marx provides a comprehensive study of man's labor activities, emphasizing their conscious and purposeful nature, universality, and freedom from immediate physical need. It is by virtue of this fact that man's labor activeness assumes an aesthetic nature since, according to Marx, man builds "according to the laws of beauty" as well. Man himself develops in the course of his labor efforts: the wealth of his senses increases and so does his ability to impose his mark on nature and to embody the various features of his being in natural objects and phenomena.

It is on this basis that the aesthetic needs of man appear together with other forms of aesthetic awareness, such as feelings, tastes, ideals, and so on. In the initial stages they are directly entwined in his practical activities. Subsequently, they gradually separate, assume a shape and acquire a certain autonomy and structure. "It is only thanks to the specifically developed wealth of human existence," Marx writes, "that the wealth of subjective human sense develops and, frequently, appears for the first time, such as an ear for music and an eye responsive to the beauty of form or, briefly stated, feelings which lead to human enjoyment and which assert themselves as essential human forces... The formation of the five external senses is the result of all previous universal history" (op. cit., p 122). Engels expressed similar thoughts. Marx further pointed out the dialectical nature of production and consumption. The production process generates not only objects for the subject but a subject for the objects. It is thus that works of art create a public which understands art.

The materialistic approach to the study of aesthetic awareness made it possible accurately to understand its real base, nature and connection with human practical activities. The idealistic views on the nature of aesthetic consciousness were refuted. The concepts of Kant, Fichte and Schelling on aesthetics proved to be groundless.

Marx's contributions to the dialectical materialistic interpretation of basic aesthetic categories deserve tremendous credit. They deal with concepts of beauty, loftiness, tragedy and comedy. The difficulty of understanding aesthetic categories lies in the fact that they reflect not only properties, relations, ties and laws within the objective world but the attitude of man toward reality as well. At this point the problem of interrelationship between the subject and object arises--one of the most difficult philosophical problems which only the founders of Marxism were able to resolve scientifically.

Marx proceeds in his analysis of aesthetic categories from the general materialistic thesis according to which aesthetic categories are a reflection of objective characteristics and relations in reality. However, aesthetic categories not only reflect the characteristics and laws of the real world but also the attitude of man toward reality, i.e., they are axiological. That is why they are described as value categories. This aspect is occasionally absolutized, thus leading to a subjectivistic interpretation of aesthetic categories, for in this case the real properties and relations within reality are ignored and everything is reduced to a subjective attitude. However, the assessment of one phenomenon or another in reality is based on knowledge of objective characteristics and the manifestation of objective significance to man.

Marx's broadest aesthetic concept is that of beauty. Actually, beauty comes in a great variety of forms, such as natural phenomena, products of man's utilitarian efforts and, quite understandably, works of art. The objective foundations of beauty are symmetry, order, measure, integrity, harmony, and purposefulness. It is true that these "laws of beauty" are manifested differently in the various areas. Harmony of sound and color is one thing while that of social relations or the harmonious development of the individual, another. "Laws of beauty" have their specific manifestations in art, where simple order, artistic truth and the progressive nature of ideas, the artist's skills, and so on are of decisive importance. We must also emphasize, however, that Marx considered beauty a specific reflection of the objective properties of objects and phenomena.

It is interesting to note that Marx did not consider natural phenomena as aesthetically neutral. Thus, he speaks of the beauty of a mineral as a natural phenomenon. It is true that a mineral could have a social significance as well. Marx also speaks of the "aesthetic properties" of gold and silver, as a result of which they could acquire a social meaning as well, as indications of surplus or wealth, social prestige, and so on. However, the aesthetic properties of these metals are related to their natural structure. Silver and gold, Marx points out, are "to a certain extent a self-generating light extracted from the ground. Silver reflects light rays in their original mixture while gold reflects merely the color of the highest stress, of

beauty. The feeling for color is the most popular form of aesthetic feelings in general" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 13, p 136). Therefore, Marx does not question the reality of objective natural beauty. The opposite view on nature is one according to which there is neither order nor disorder, and neither beauty nor ugliness. This is inherent in mechanistic, metaphysical materialism. In other words, nature could be considered an aesthetic value and as the bearer of a specific social content. In our age the problem of environmental protection and the aesthetic educational importance of nature play a major role. In this area our science of aesthetics can and must have a say on the basis of Marx's fundamental statements.

Marx discusses the category of loftiness as well. As we know, this category became part of the system of basic aesthetic concepts in the period of later antiquity. It was the subject of serious attention in the aesthetics of the English enlightenment and in the works of Kant and the aestheticists of the Hegelian school. Hegel himself did not consider loftiness very important, relating its development only to Oriental art which, in his view, was a manifestation of the limited nature of the initial phase of Oriental art. For a long period of time beauty was considered the main object of art. This tradition comes from antiquity and was preserved by the outstanding aestheticians and art theoreticians. However, are there disharmonious and exaggerated phenomena in art which suppress man? It turns out that this is possible if they are interpreted not as distorted but as lofty. Theories appeared in the 1840s in German aesthetics, which defended the right of even distorted phenomena to be depicted in art. Marx related loftiness to the development of actual historical events and it was on this level that he considered loftiness as represented by heroism. The latter is conceived by Marx as one of the highest moral-aesthetic values. The revolutionary struggle against the old world and the building of a new society naturally demand of the individual a lofty ethical spirit, purposefulness, revolutionary discipline and courage. The great revolutionary felt close to and understood lofty ideals, hence his interest in loftiness in life and art.

Marx's statements on tragedy are of basic significance. Tragic conflicts reflect the real contradictions of life. This is the nature of their profound objective meaning. Both tragic situations and tragic characters change together with changes in historical conditions. That is when Marx and Engels analyzed in detail the types of tragic conflicts and means for their artistic representation. Of great interest in this respect is the correspondence between Marx and Engels, on the one hand, and Lassalle, on the other, on the subject of the latter's drama "Franz von Sickingen."

The cosmic aspect--another most important aesthetic category--is considered by Marx as a specific reflection of contradictions within social development. This means that he considers objective laws as the base of the cosmic element. Something outlives its century but, nevertheless, lays a claim to existence and recognition. It may have no meaning but does have pomposity. This is an example of a cosmic contradiction. The cosmic element triggers various types of laughter. According to Marx, it is an expression of the contradictions within reality and the assertion of specific social values.

In identifying the materialistic content of the basic aesthetic categories, Marx points out their dialectical nature. The dialectical essence of fundamental aesthetic concepts is manifested quite clearly in the categories of the tragic and the comical, for they reflect social conflicts through different means. The category of beauty is distinguished by its greater scope, for it encompasses not only social but natural phenomena, characteristics and laws. Symmetry, unity within variety and harmony are the objective foundations of beauty. Such concepts, however, become apparent through the dialectical law of the unity and struggle of opposites. This becomes particularly clear in the study of harmony in terms of an aesthetic concept. Expediency, as the objective base for the beauty of animate nature is equally dialectical. Conscious expediency has an aesthetic value in the process of human labor activities based "on the laws of beauty."

Marx and Engels were the first to provide a scientific interpretation of the basic aesthetic categories.

However, the founders of Marxism did not commit themselves to the study of the most common aesthetic concepts. They paid great attention to the study of art as a specific area of human creativity. Marx considers art from the gnosiological, social and axiological (value) viewpoints. From the gnosiological viewpoint, it is a specific form of reflection, of knowledge of the real world. Naturally, a reflection does not always have to be true. It could be imaginary or twisted. Nevertheless, it will remain a reflection of an external world which exists independently of man. Marx approaches dialectically the process of awareness of reality itself. This is what distinguishes him from the old materialists (the 18th-century French materialists and L. Feuerbach). It is thus that this great proletarian philosopher applies the basic concepts of dialectical materialism to the study of art.

The accuracy of Marx's conclusions is confirmed by the history of the development of global artistic culture. He knew well that all great artists and writers aspired toward an all-embracing and true reproduction of reality and that the criterion of the greatness of their art had always been the fullness of their scope and accuracy of reflection of the external world. In analyzing the works of the English 19th-century novelists Dickens, Thackeray, Bronte, andaskell, Marx wrote that "this brilliant galaxy of contemporary British novelists characterized all bourgeois strata in their vivid and eloquent books, and disclosed more political and social truths than all professional and social politicians, journalists and moralists combined..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 10, p 648). A similar thought was expressed by Engels in his characterization of Balzac's works.

What matters is that both Marx and Engels proceeded from the idea that on the level of cognitive possibilities no basic disparity exists between science and art. Both firmly believed that true art, just like any science, can penetrate deeply in the processes of social life through the depiction of human characters, conflicts and passions, and bring to light the laws governing social life. This explains why the founders of the proletarian outlook put the problem of realism in the center of their aesthetic studies. From their viewpoint, realism is an artistic method which ensures the most

profound knowledge of the real world. Naturally, it is not a question of a photographic representation of what the sensory organs perceive directly. For example, in criticizing Schellig, the neo-Hegelian, Marx notes that, in his effort to structure most random and unique definitions of the subject, he becomes the "slave" of this subject. Any aspiration to record the accidental, the nonessential is considered by Marx fatal to true art. According to his viewpoint art is truthful only when it is a live representation of what is essential and natural in an object or phenomenon and expresses their true nature.

While facing the artist with the task of profoundly penetrating into the essence of reality, Marx also firmly opposes schematism in the depiction of said reality. Thus, on the subject of Lassalle's play "Franz von Sickingen" he wrote to the author that "... I consider as your main fault the fact that you are writing like Schiller, converting individuals into simple megaphones of the spirit of the times" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 29, p 484).

Discussing the same play, Engels advised Lassalle "not to forget the realistic for the sake of the ideal or Shakespeare for the sake of Schiller" (ibid., p 494).

Quite interesting in this connection is Marx's subject of accuracy in depicting political leaders. In analyzing the books written by A. Chenu and L. Delaode, which described some French political leaders of the first half of the 19th century, they said that it would have been desirable for the political personalities "to be, once and for all, depicted in the severe Rembrandtian colors, in all their truthfulness. All descriptions given of these individuals never present them in their real aspect but only in their official capacity, in a tragic pose and a halo around their heads. The truthfulness of the depiction is lost in such enthusiastically recreated Raphaelite portraits" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 7, p 280).

A. Chenu and L. Delaode are the other extreme. They eliminate the tragedy and the halo "from the 'great men' of the February revolution," "penetrate into the private existence of these gentlemen, showing them in their underwear.... This, however, does not make them any less different from a truly truthful depiction of individuals and events" (ibid.).

The critical analysis of "The Secrets of Paris" by E. Sue, which is provided in "The Holy Family," is thoroughly imbued with the demand for truthfulness. The idea was subsequently developed by Engels. As we know, it was he who provided a classical definition of realism. Engels discussed the problem of type classification as well. The founders of Marxism considered the concept of the typical as the dialectical unity between what was legitimate and essential and universal with what was specifically historical, transitory and individually unique. As we can see, Marx and Engels formulated the fundamental principles of the realistic artistic method, thus defining the prospects for the development of art in the future. As an artistic method of socialist art, socialist realism is entirely based on the Marxist theory of realism. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of this theory to the development of the artistic culture of the socialist society.

As a specific form of knowledge of reality, art appears, develops, and functions within specific historical conditions. For this reason, the founders of Marxism considered it not only as a purely gnosiological but a social phenomenon. They were interested in the social nature of artistic culture. From Marx's viewpoint the nature, origin, development and social role of art can be understood only on the basis of an integral social system. As Marx justifiably pointed out, art is merely part of the integral social process, the material foundation of which is found in the development of production forces and production relations as two inseparable aspects of the production method. "The method for the production of material life," Marx pointed out, "determines the social, political and spiritual processes of life in general. It is not the awareness of the people which determines their way of life but, conversely, their social life determines their awareness" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 13, p 7). Such is the brilliant Marxian formulation of the basic concept of historical materialism. This concept is of key significance in understanding all social phenomena such as the state, law, morality, religion, science and art. It was decisive in terms of the development of dialectical materialistic aesthetics. Thanks to the materialistic understanding of history an explanation became possible for the origin of art, its blossoming and decadence during some historical periods and the determination of the reasons for which some artistic directions predominated in some historical epochs while others developed at different ages and why there were changes in art methods and styles. All of these problems remained a profound secret in pre-Marxist aesthetics. It was only from the positions of historical materialism that the origin of art and literature and the laws and directions in their development, their blossoming and decline and their role in social life could be interpreted and understood accurately.

Historical materialism considers the economic base the determining principle which defines the laws of historical development of art and other superstructural phenomena. In this connection, the forms of ideology--art among them--operate as something deriving from the base. However, Marx deemed it important to emphasize the complexity of interaction between the base and the superstructure. "In terms of art," he wrote, "we know that some periods of its blossoming are hardly consistent with the overall development of society and, consequently, the development of the material foundations of the latter, constituting the framework of its organization. Thus compare, for example, the Greeks to contemporary nations or even to Shakespeare" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 12, p 736).

In this case Marx emphasized that some forms of art are possible only at the lower stages of social development, the age of the heroic epic, for example. In clarifying his idea he referred to ancient Greek art. As we know, Greek mythology was not only the arsenal of Greek art but its soil. "Is it possible for this view of nature and social relations," Marx asks, "on which Greek fantasy is based and, therefore, Greek (art), to remain in the age of the existence of rural factors, railroads, locomotive engines and the telegraph?" (ibid., pp 736-737). "Ignoring this, we may adopt the illusions of the 18th-century French, so beautifully mocked by Lessing. Since in the fields of mechanics and others we have surpassed the ancients, why not develop our own epic as well? It is thus that the 'Iliad' is replaced by the 'Henriad' (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 26, part I, p 280).

Consequently, according to Marx an economic upsurge does not correspond mandatorily in the least to a similar upsurge in literature and art. We come across similar thoughts in Engels, who noted in the 1890s that the young Marxists simplify the concepts of historical materialism. Marx and Engels firmly opposed any kind of schematism. They demanded a specific historical approach to the various phenomena of spiritual culture and ideology.

Marx considered the disproportion between the development of artistic culture and society as a whole in antagonistic systems as a manifestation of deeper contradictions inherent in these systems. This becomes particularly clear in the capitalist society. Based on his study of capitalist contradictions, Marx reaches the exceptionally important conclusion in terms of aesthetics and the theory and history of art according to which "... capitalist production is hostile to the familiar spiritual production sectors, art and poetry, for example" (ibid.). Schiller, Goethe, the romanticists and Hegel as well spoke of the hostility of capitalism toward artistic-aesthetic creativity. However, they were unable to provide a scientific explanation for this fact or draw accurate conclusions. Goethe and Schiller even nurtured illusions concerning the possibility of a harmonious development of the various types and genres of art under bourgeois conditions. The romantics assumed that on the basis of art itself and only through its means the aesthetic helplessness of bourgeois reality could be overcome. Hegel reached the pessimistic conclusion of the total regress of art in general.

Marx based his conclusion on the hostility of capitalism toward art and poetry on his comprehensive study of the economic and political categories in bourgeois society. He considered this hostility as a hostility to the toiling man. It was rooted in the capitalist form of exploitation which destroys, distorts and belittles man, depriving him of freedom, independence, initiative and autonomy. Based on his study of the works of Shakespeare, Goethe and other writers, Marx exposed the inhuman nature of money as a tool of capitalist exploitation. The capitalist world itself is hostile to art and beauty through its entire structure. Marx's conclusion, therefore, is that art can be saved only through the revolutionary transformation of social relations. The social revolution alone, according to Marx, can provide favorable conditions for artistic progress. Therefore, Marx relates the problems of art and aesthetics to those of the proletarian revolution. He saw the proletariat as the true bearer of progress in politics, economics and culture. The same views were supported by Engels. Therefore, the hostility of capitalism toward art cannot be surmounted on the basis of art itself. The only possible way is the destruction of capitalism and the building of a new society--a socialist society. History proved that Marx and Engels were absolutely right in their conclusions.

The art of socialist realism is following the path earmarked by the great developers of philosophical-aesthetic thinking. "... Practical experience indicates," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov pointed out, "how complex are many of the problems arising on the path to the building of socialism. However, it also proves that socialism alone can resolve the most complex problems of social life."

In considering art a reflection of reality, the founders of dialectical materialistic aesthetics emphasized that under the conditions of a class antagonistic society this reflection always has a class conflicting nature. Marx and Engels gave the science of aesthetics a reliable criterion for the accurate assessment of complex ideological phenomena such as art, philosophy, morality, religion, etc., with their theory of the class nature of social consciousness. In pointing out the class base of art and its class and party orientation, Marx and Engels pointed out the need to take into consideration the entire complexity of class struggle and the variety of conflicting forms of its reflection in art and literature. On the basis of their study of Schiller, Goethe, Balzac and others, they convincingly proved that one artistic phenomenon or another cannot be properly understood and interpreted without taking into consideration the entire complexity and contradictoriness of the class struggle at a specific stage in history.

The class-party approach is the most important methodological principle in the study of the complex phenomena of spiritual culture. Unfortunately, to this day it is not always consistently applied in the consideration of problems related to the utilization of the ideological legacy of previous epochs. Violations of the Marxist principle in the approach to the study, assessment and utilization of the cultural legacy of the past have been reported in the press.

Marx's greatest merit is that he not only explained the origin of political, philosophical, moral and artistic-aesthetic ideas, but that for the first time in the history of the development of human thinking, he defined their true role in social life. Marx is a scientist-revolutionary in spirit. He considered the purpose of knowledge not only in terms of the interpretation of the world but, in the final account, its revolutionary change. As a great revolutionary, the founder of the proletarian outlook considered art a powerful weapon in the study and transformation of the world. It was no accident that he paid great attention to problems of art and struggled for the assertion within it of high idea-mindedness and true artistic wealth and tried to involve noted writers and poets and did everything possible to use the progressive legacy of the past in the interests of the proletariat. Marx and Engels laid the theoretical foundations of the policy pursued by the Leninist party in art and literature.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/18

CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF INTENSIFICATION AND THE
FINANCIAL-CREDIT MECHANISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83) pp 41-52

[Article by M. Zotov, chairman of the board, USSR Stroybank]

[Text] Capital construction is one of the leading trends in the USSR national economy. It accounts for about 10 percent of the GNP. Ten percent of the country's working people are in construction. The country, which invests substantial funds in the development of the national economy, justifiably expects from them maximal returns.

1

Economic tools for influencing collective interests, such as finances related to the accumulation and utilization of enterprise and organization funds and bank loans, are assigned an active role in the management of the investment cycle.

Finances and credit are also sources of capital investment and methods of economic incentive for the participants in the investment cycle, as well as an economic method which relates current output to the satisfaction of requirements for capital investments and the latter's recoverability. Thus, in principle enterprise funds for financing capital investments should be acquired by cost-effective enterprises and associations on the basis of the efficient management of their economy and their profits and through amortization withholdings in amounts which would satisfy their various requirements. Credit is primarily extended on the basis of the planned-normative deadlines for the recovery of capital investments. This encourages the participants in the investment cycle to become comprehensively concerned with the prompt utilization of such credits and the repayment of bank loans as a result of the fast completion of capacities and reaching planned technical and economic production indicators. Savings in bank loan interest rates, with the successful use of such loans and their repayment, increases the economic incentive funds of production collectives, while overruns reduce them. Therefore, such incentives in the development of the current production process are economically related to increased capacities while capital investments are related to their recoverability through the further development and enhancement of production efficiency.

The trend toward increasing the role of enterprise funds and long-term data in their dynamics over several years (based on construction projects financed by the USSR Sroybank) is particularly clear.

Year	Sources of capital investment financing (%)		
	Budget funds	Enterprise funds	Long-term credits
1966	57.9	41.9	0.2
1970	49.3	48.4	2.3
1975	47.7	47.0	5.3
1980	43.2	50.2	6.6
1981	44.8	50.2	5.0
1982	43.6	51.8*	4.6*

* In a production area the share of credits in financing sources was 12-14 percent; it was more than 30 percent in some sectors.

A general trend of the same nature may be traced in all capital investments, although less clearly. This is related to the fact that the budget remains a most important source of financing by the USSR Gosbank for planned state capital investments in agriculture, with 66 percent; the other financing is, as a rule, out of enterprise funds.

It is necessary to emphasize that the use of one source of financing or another is largely related to the use of specific methods for financial control of capital investments. The skillful handling of the various methods--budgetary and credit--as well as the use of enterprise and association funds, organically combined in specific proportions, is related to the art of resolving large-scale intersectorial problems, the ability to conduct a planned economic maneuver and firmly pursue a line consistent with national interests.

Despite a reduction in the share of the budget, it accounts for a significant share of capital investment sources. This situation will clearly not substantially change this five-year plan. The need for the active use of the budget method for financing investments is determined above all by the special role which the state plays in the development of the socialist economy, the purpose of which is to ensure the proportional growth of the national economy, the shaping of its optimal structure, the development of new economic areas and the rational deployment of production forces. The budget finances the largest government measures which influence improvements in the national economic structure and the solution of major economic and social problems.

In defining the limits of application of the budget investment method, we should bear in mind that such limits, as they affect enterprises, associations, ministries and departments, are not directly and closely dependent on the implementation of their plans for basic activities or are directly related to the efficiency of installed productive capital or cost-effective management methods.

Therefore, under the circumstances of the development of cost-effective relations and increased cost-effective autonomy and responsibility of enterprises, associations and organizations, the limits of utilization of enterprise funds for financing and bank credits, particularly in terms of operating production facilities, have been substantially expanded. The role of such sources will increase with the accelerated recovery of capital investments. It is particularly important in the further strengthening of true cost-effectiveness.

In our view, it would be expedient gradually to reduce the budget financing of investments in industrial sectors in which, by virtue of short-term deadlines for the recovery of outlays, the same personal funds and bank loans should be used in construction. It is unnecessary to make use of budgetary appropriations to cover outlays for production reconstruction and technical retooling. Here the possibility exists, with the help of other sources, to link more tightly current output to the interests of its development through capital investments. It would be expedient to use credits for the full financing of individual projects, complexes and construction sites.

Considering the growing role of credits and enterprise funds, the question of harnessing the latter--profits and amortization--and control over such funds on the part of bank institutions arises urgently. The problem of enterprise sources is related to the gradual conversion of ministries, associations and large enterprises to the normative method of profit distribution. Therefore, the task becomes for each ministry to have its own financial resources (through centralization and redistribution of the funds of its enterprises and associations). As to the redistribution of enterprise funds, the measure should be considered provisional. Approaching this matter from the positions of cost-effectiveness, it would be economically justified for the enterprises to increase their sources of financing not through the redistribution mechanism but through loans. The temporarily available funds of other enterprises of the respective ministries or associations should be used as credit resources; in such cases the banks should pay a certain interest for their use. This should encourage enterprises which do not have all the necessary funds they need but which need such funds for expanded reproduction purposes to seek possibilities of harnessing internal economic reserves and increasing their profitability. Unquestionably, all of this will strengthen the cost-effectiveness interrelationship on the sectorial basis between expanded reproduction of productive capital and results of current activities.

At the present time, since enterprises (associations) transfer a significant share of their own investment financing sources to other production units within the sector, the former are insufficiently interested in the timely accumulation of their own funds and the latter in their efficient utilization. Considering the fact that the percentage of enterprise funds redistributed on a centralized basis is relatively high, this fact, related to the weakening of cost-effectiveness principles in the activities of the main production unit, cannot be ignored.

In the future, as large enterprises and production associations convert to the normative profit distribution method, financing with enterprise funds will yield considerably better results, for it will be based on the efficient

use of cost-effective principles of economic incentive and responsibility of labor collectives for the accumulation and spending of actually saved funds. Naturally, the need for a certain redistribution of enterprise sources for capital investments within the sector (subsector) will not disappear entirely. Its scale, however, will be reduced substantially (such redistribution could be regulated here again on a normative basis).

The definition of the optimal limits for the utilization of the budget and of enterprise resources will make it possible, if necessary, to assign a more essential role in capital investment sources to long-term bank loans, the share of which currently, as we pointed out, is small.

However, both theory and practice confirm the legitimacy and efficiency of the active utilization of bank credits in the investment process. By substantially enhancing the role of credits in securing capital investments the possibility arises of strengthening the planned economic relations among the participants in the investment process and upgrading their efficiency. Such credit uses are based on the special role which credit plays among the many economic instruments of economic management and the special role of loans in the distribution and redistribution of funds among the various national economic units and the allocation of financial resources to sectors, associations and enterprises which will enable them to fulfill their state plans. By requiring the steady recovery and profitability of credited enterprises and the repayment of loans, the credit mechanism actively contributes to the development of cost-effective relations in capital construction. Credits make it possible to direct the participants in the investment process to the choice of the most efficient solutions, economical use of funds and harnessing of intraeconomic resources for loan repayment. Because of their great maneuverability and flexibility, bank credits may be used as a stable financial base in implementing the initiatives of participants in capital construction in their search for optimal economic management variants.

Credits, which are related to the plan for the development of the national economy through the credit plan, operate as an instrument in the implementation of the uniform investment policy of the state and the observance of planned ratios for the allocation of resources and their utilization in accordance with social requirements. In the course of credit planning the bank can realize the need for the allocation of manpower and material resources for construction with the help of financial resources. Through the credit mechanism the bank supervises the implementation of capital construction plans.

Therefore, credits may be efficiently used as a method for planning and for the economic orientation of production collectives toward the implementation of planned assignments through the energizing of cost-effectiveness principles. Let us point out that more than 80 percent of all enterprises built during the 10th Five-Year Plan and the first 2 years of the 11th with the help of loans were completed within the planned-normative deadlines. This percentage highly exceeds the share of enterprises completed with the help of other sources for the financing of capital investments. The capacities installed through credits are also mastered more successfully than those based

on the use of other financing sources (58 percent of them on time or ahead of time), thanks to the substantially increased economic influence of the bank on the participants in the investment process (with a comprehensive use of the credit mechanism).

Therefore, the individual sources of investment funds have their own area of dissemination in which they alone can display quite stably their specific qualities and tangibly affect the increased efficiency of the investment process. No single source can replace the others; it is only their optimal combination that fully answers the overall requirements of the production process and economically stimulates the accelerated growth of efficiency.

It is important at the present stage to choose accurately the projects and construction sites to be financed through credits.

Today the enterprises must carry out technical retooling, expansion and reconstruction operations on the basis of their individual, scientifically substantiated, long-term development plans. These plans should stipulate specific technological sequences for the individual stages: technical and organizational improvements of the production process, partial expansion of production capacities and reconstruction which, as a rule, presumes change in the basic technological process. In order to prevent violations in the proportional development, the plants must coordinate the growth of production capacities with the growth rates of the respective sectors.

In the course of observing these conditions, the bank organs can control the deadlines for the individual stages and the expediency with which one source or another is used in the implementation of capital investments, based on reconstruction, expansion and technical retooling deadlines. Bank control must be increased also in the area of the prompt renovation of productive capital, equipment above all. Bearing in mind that replacement deadlines are exceptionally stressed today, such control is particularly important and necessary.

The question of financing procedures arises in connection with the implementation of a number of large-scale target programs for the development of the national economy and the territorial-production complexes (TPK). Practical experience has proved that the financing of target programs and TPK construction by various ministries lead to discoordination in receiving allocations and material support. Bearing this in mind, it might be better to try financial support methods such as directive redistribution of planned funds under ministry control, transferred to the bank for the duration of the construction period. In turn, the USSR Stroybank could assign credits for the development of the territorial-production complexes and the implementation of target programs. In this case, the credit mechanism would begin actively to contribute to the implementation of target programs and the synchronized development of all sectors within the TPK. Furthermore, credits could be used for purposes of exercising efficient control over the efficiency of the implemented measures and recovery of capital investments. The banks can thus contribute to the elimination of departmentalism in financial support of progressive structural and territorial changes in the development of the

production process which lead to the intensification of the socialist economy. In all cases, it is necessary as of now to improve the methods for financing the construction of TPK and the implementation of target programs if substantial losses are to be prevented.

2

A substantial growth of capital investment sources based on long-term credits is natural in the developed socialist stage. The question of the expediency of its active utilization was positively resolved as early as the mid-1960s. This was reflected in a number of party documents. The importance of this problem was emphasized at the 25th and 26th CPSU congresses. However, to this day no decisive turn toward the more energetic utilization of long-term credits has taken place.

Practical experience indicates that this called for the development of the necessary prerequisites and the solution of a number of general economic and specific (financial-credit) problems. It is a question of converting to a comprehensive and intensively expanded reproduction, the reorganization of the system of planning, including financial-credit, the orientation of all participants in the investment process toward end results, the development of cost-effective relations in the sectors and substantially enhancing the economic interest and material responsibility of all units in the implementation of their functions.

Based on a consideration for the general directions followed in improving capital construction planning and management, the 12 July 1979 CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree defines specifically and systematically the methods and conditions for the intensive development of credit relations between banks and capital construction and earmarks the solution of problems arising in this connection.

The fact that the USSR Sroybank, together with the planning, financial and economic organizations, sought for a number of years the most efficient means of financing and credit in capital investments and was able to achieve some results was taken into consideration in regulating these methods.

At the time the decree was promulgated the annual volume of long-term loans issued by the USSR Sroybank had reached almost 8 billion rubles and total indebtedness exceeded 28 billion. Today about one-fifth of all long-term credits goes to technical retooling and reconstruction of existing enterprises, thus contributing to improving the technological structure of capital investments. In this case, we must bear in mind that each percentage of growth of equipment in capital investments means, as estimated by the USSR Sroybank, the additional production of industrial output worth approximately 1 billion rubles.

In 1982 long-term credits were used by 2,153 enterprises. The overall cost of credited projects was 77.7 billion rubles, 25 percent of which accounted for more than 50 percent. Three-quarters of all enterprises and projects built with the help of bank loans in 1982 were completed on time or ahead of time, thus commissioning productive capital worth 7.5 billion rubles.

On the basis of the tasks formulated at the 26th Congress, loans are directed toward the development of consumer goods, improving population consumer services, expanding the network of trade and public catering enterprises and housing construction. Thus, 232 enterprises engaged in the production of consumer goods, 567 trade, public catering and service enterprises, 133 auxiliary farms, and so on, were completed in 1982. A total of 1,195 cooperative house buildings totaling 5,477,000 square meters were commissioned in cities and worker settlements. Loans for such projects alone totaled 484.7 million rubles.

Borrowed funds are becoming a mandatory prerequisite for the continuing financing of construction projects which are successfully fulfilling and overfulfilling their capital construction plans. In 1982 the Stroybank granted loans for such construction projects totaling 562 million rubles, as a result of which an increased number of production capacities was achieved in a number of large enterprises. The bank also gives priority to contracting organizations which are successfully implementing their tasks related to the completion of projects and production capacities. At the beginning of 1983, 519 organizations, including 324 with interest rates reduced by one half, enjoyed such benefits.

This means that the long-term credit relations between banks and enterprises and associations are highly efficient. We find here the presence of the social aspect of efficiency, particularly in the case of loans for increasing the production of consumer goods and construction materials made of local raw materials and expanding the technical base for the procurement, storage and processing of vegetables and fruits, and improving population consumer services. They help to strengthen monetary circulation and to link supply with demand and are characterized by increased investment recovery.

Like other financing sources, bank credits contribute to the installation of progressive equipment and modern production tools which facilitate the work, enhance its creative nature and improve production conditions. In industry loans are used to replace, purchase and update equipment, including disassembling and assembling operations, the mechanization of basic and auxiliary production processes, the installation of assembly lines and automated systems, and improving the technology and intensification of production processes.

In 1982 the USSR Stroybank lent 846.5 million rubles in long-term credits for the technical retooling and reconstruction of 894 operating enterprises which completed 975 measures aimed at the installation of progressive technology, production mechanization and automation, and modernization and replacement of obsolete and physically worn-out equipment. Long-term credits helped 623 enterprises to complete 886 projects within planned deadlines. The implementation of 579 measures helped to earn additional profits totaling 372.6 million rubles and release 12,200 men.

Today such measures are primarily implemented through capital investments, material resources and contracting work to the extent of available ceilings. Furthermore, in order actively to support the initiative of production collectives, it is allowed to implement outside the plan, with loans, highly

efficient measures for the development of science and technology and to develop the production of consumer goods providing that such credited projects can be completed within 1 year and that the recovery of capital investments and repayment of the loan are completed within 2 years from the day of the completion of the project.

At the present time, when according to the instructions of the 26th CPSU Congress, problems are being resolved related to raising all economic sectors to the advanced level of science and technology and gradually eliminating manual labor through mechanization, the USSR Srobybank and the financial-credit resources it allocates for corresponding measures begin to play a more important role. The low rate of mechanization of manual labor considerably depreciates other measures aimed at upgrading efficiency. Clearly, the banks have the opportunity to make a substantial contribution to the implementation of the comprehensive target program for reducing the use of manual labor and, together with the planning and economic organs, to formulate means for the acceleration of the solution of this problem by granting corresponding loans for such purposes. Let us recall that in the 1950s and 1960s the USSR Gosbank and USSR Srobybank made extensive loans for "minor mechanization," particularly for the elimination of so-called bottlenecks in the overall technological process and the intensification of production processes. Let us point out that this step yielded exceptional economic benefits.

The successful use of such loans on a broad scale is one of the important conditions for the intensification of the socialist economy and the enhancement of production efficiency. Generally speaking, the use of long-term credits provide an idea of their particular significance in using the opportunities offered by the scientific and technical revolution and improving the material and technical base of developed socialism.

Practical experience proved the need of including in credit relations all participants in the investment process and the expediency of granting them both long- and short-term and medium-term loans. Long-term credits frequently prove to be ineffective unless backed by the entire range of credit relations involving all participants in the construction cycle. The elimination from this area of any participant harms the system of economic relations among organizations operating in capital construction, based on their equal economic incentive and identical material responsibility for end construction results. This also means that the forms of credit relations with each economic organization must be different. In each specific case different types of bank loans are necessary based on the observance or violation of crediting conditions. It is only the full set of bank influence measures, which constitute a single comprehensive process, which can yield the necessary results and which enables us more rapidly to determine and localize bottlenecks, establish intraeconomic reserves and involve them in the economic cycle.

For this purpose the individual sectors and areas conducted and worked on experiments which enabled them in practical terms, through the credit-accounting mechanism, to assess the possibility of comprehensively improving the management of capital construction, identify trends and refine details in the advancement of the investment mechanism. Such an experiment has been conducted by the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Industrial Construction since

1973. A conversion was made to planning commodity construction output and completion of enterprises, projects and capacities under construction in physical terms. The extensive development of credit relations among participants in the investment process, based on completed projects, was made possible. The results proved to be encouraging and were taken into consideration in the formulation of the familiar CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers 12 July 1979 decree. The results of the work of the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Industrial Construction continued to improve during the 10th Five-Year Plan: the completion of various projects compared to the previous five-year plan increased by 37 percent and the length of construction of industrial-production projects was reduced by 17 percent. In 1980 about one-half of all production capacities and projects were completed within planned and normative deadlines.

This made apparent the need substantially to expand short-term credit relations with participants in the investment cycle. This was further based on the fact that by the end of 1975 the share of bank loans in the working capital of contracting construction organizations did not exceed 16 percent.

In recent years a great deal of effort had been made to develop short-term credit relations between participants in the investment cycle and the bank. Currently the share of bank loans in the working capital of contracting organizations has increased significantly and is in excess of 70 percent. Loans account for virtually all outlays on unfinished production. Actual outlays are credited as well. This is a basically important distinction compared with advance payments received from customers. However, this is not to say that the process of developing working capital has been completed. It requires further improvements and an increased share of funds owned by construction organizations. This can be achieved in two ways: the first is to accumulate such funds at the expense of the ceiling of capital investments on the part of customers, bearing in mind that the construction project is continuing; the second, currently used in industry, is to borrow funds for working capital for a specific time period (7-8 years), repayable from accumulations. Unquestionably, this is the most difficult method which, however, increases responsibility for end results. The development of an optimal structure of financial sources for working capital requires both the further development of credit relations between contracting organizations and bank offices and the enhanced role of enterprise funds in construction.

This process must be present at all stages in the investment cycle and contribute to enhancing the efficiency of capital investments.

Currently credit relations between banks and design and research organizations are developing intensively at the design stage. Computations are made on comprehensive cost estimate documentation and differentiated interest rates are charged based on the observance of design deadlines and quality. This makes it possible to make fuller use of loans in increasing the influence on such organizations. The credit-accountability mechanism is being directed toward converting estimates and lists of projects into stable norms for construction planning and financing and stimulating the development of plans based on progressive scientific and technical solutions, which make

possible the efficient utilization of material, financial and manpower resources. Responsibility for the prompt implementation of completed documents and improving their quality can be achieved also by issuing loans to customers for the payment of design costs. In such cases, should the documents remain unused or prove to be substandard, the repayment of loans issued for such purposes will be based on the results of basic activities. This creates conditions for strengthening bank control over the stability of construction cost estimates and the elimination of unnecessary cost eliminating the type of losses incurred at the present time.

The reconstruction of operating enterprises, like new construction, must be based on the most progressive technical solutions. The following requirement must be strictly observed in this case: blueprints based on the same basic solution for the main technological process must stipulate the systematic reduction of specific capital investments (compared with the preceding year). Should the solution be changed, the latest designs must call for reducing the overall amount of current operational and capital outlays per unit of output.

One of the measures which help to bring our machine-building output closer to progressive foreign output (in terms of quality, productivity and weight) is basing the new prices (for new equipment models) on world prices and, after the formulation of standards for series production of new models, their consistency with the best world prototypes. Gosstandart must review our standards in order to make them as good as the best international ones.

The conversion of construction and design organizations to computations based on the indicator of finished commodity construction output and continuing short-term crediting of outlays would ensure the uninterrupted financing of outlays by construction organizations at all stages in the circulation of funds and will create prerequisites for normalizing the financing situation of construction organizations. However, the crediting process itself must be strictly differentiated. Should contractors and design institutes violate planned deadlines for the delivery of finished projects to the customer, the bank organs must continue to grant credits but at higher interest rates.

Naturally, the question of not issuing any more loans may arise should the construction organizations allow losses to occur as a result of negligence. The new conditions governing the accumulation of working capital and covering contractor outlays enable us to increase through loans our influence on unfinished production, i.e., to make it consistent with the norms.

The time has come to erect an "economic barrier" on the way leading to increased volumes of unfinished construction, for this involves substantial funds which fail to yield necessary returns and delay the production of goods needed by the national economy. Loans for unfinished construction enable us to ensure more efficient control over the condition of construction and installation projects and the implementation of the plan for the commission of capacities.

The appointment of head procurement plants in charge of the timely and qualitative completion of construction projects with the necessary equipment and its

commissioning within the stipulated deadlines, settling accounts between customers and suppliers following the acceptance of equipment which has been assembled and has undergone comprehensive tests, and granting suppliers bank loans to cover outlays for unfinished projects are all measures which should accelerate the commissioning of the equipment and ensure the better balancing of natural and value systems in the national economy.

As was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, in some sectors enterprises should be built with bank financing granted to the contracting organizations, covering the total cost estimates of the projects and the delivery of finished enterprises ready to operate. This type of crediting was tested experimentally. Nineteen of the 27 completed enterprises were finished on time or ahead of time and resulted in savings of about 1 million rubles (3.7 percent of the overall cost estimates). The delivery of ready-to-operate projects took place at the end of the period of their mastery and commissioning, which helps to reduce construction time.

The credit mechanism actively influences not only the effectiveness of construction output but also taking the results to consumers at the lowest possible loss. The crediting mechanism, which organically blends within the single economic mechanism, helps to upgrade the efficiency of the economic management system. The success of this influence is determined by the systematic improvement of the credit mechanism and its structural elements.

Let us note in this connection that the efficiency with which the financing and crediting mechanism is used also largely depends on the efficiency of its influence on strengthening cost-effectiveness among the participants in the investment complex. That is why we must clearly define the limits of payment credits granted to customers for the purpose of settling accounts for deliveries promptly. If such deliveries are made in accordance with concluded contracts, i.e., on time and with the proper quality and variety and at stipulated prices, should the purchaser experience temporary financial difficulties the bank would be justified in giving him the necessary credit assistance by granting loans for settling accounts in accordance with point 57 of the 12 July 1979 CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree.

However, heads of enterprises, associations and organizations frequently demand payment loans regardless of the observance of said stipulations, and even when losses and negligence have been allowed to occur. This is inconsistent with the nature of credits as an economic lever which influences the strengthening of true cost-effectiveness. Naturally, exceptions may be made if the superior organization guarantees the repayability of the loan and takes measures aimed at improving economic and financial activities.

In this area the bank establishments must defend the national interests. In cases in which deliveries are not entirely consistent with concluded contracts or the financial difficulties of the payor are of a durable nature, no payment loans should be granted. A loan granted under such circumstances would mean that the bank is contributing to violations of contractual and financial discipline. The fact that a payor experiences lengthy financial difficulties and systematically delays payments is an indication of his poor

and uneconomical management or illegal use of material, manpower and financial resources and failure to implement state plans. Granting loans to such payors means lowering their responsibility for their own errors.

Accepting the requirement of granting payment credits in all cases means accepting the fact that the banks perform the function of a universal payor. The elements of automatic response in issuing payment credits must be eliminated. Loans should not be used to cover gaps in the activities of enterprises and organizations or their negligence.

The measures earmarked to improve national economic planning raise new requirements concerning the organization of credit planning. A consolidated financial balance (with a breakdown of income and expenditures by individual years within the five-year plan) will be developed henceforth within the framework of the state five-year plan for economic and social development. It will stipulate the availability of financial and credit resources for all planned measures aimed at economic development. Taking this into consideration, the bank organs must formulate and submit to the USSR Gosplan plan estimates on long-term and short-term credits for the five-year period (with annual breakdowns). This will call for upgrading the level of credit planning.

The planning, finance and bank organs must ensure the planned, interrelated and coordinated use of finances and credits in capital construction. We believe that in the future we must convert to the formulation of a single five-year financial-credit plan which will have a separate section on available financial and credit resources for capital construction, based on capital investment plans and material-technical support. This will enable us to balance more efficiently capital investment plans with financing sources, increase the stimulating role of finances and credits in upgrading the efficiency of the investment process and create conditions for continuing financing and material support for construction and will accelerate the completion of production capacities.

In recent years, thanks to the efforts of party, soviet, planning, economic and financial-banking organs, we have been able not only to stop the growth of unfinished construction but even to reduce it in terms of the volume of capital investments.

It is important not only to consolidate the achieved positive results but to develop them maximally. In this case a great deal depends on improving the financial-credit mechanism for controlling capital investments and increasing the role of the USSR Sroybank in their centralized planning, with a view to the successful implementation of the country's investment program. Its implementation triggers profound processes which require a comprehensive study and efficient resolution. Modern computers are of great help in this area.

Thus, the Moscow city office of the Sroybank has set up an automated integrated system for construction financing and crediting. It is directed toward the use of a unified computer system with all base program support and an extensive set of terminals which ensure the processing of bank data by

remote control. Leading scientists from a number of the largest institutes in our country participated in the development and installation of the system which is oriented toward radical improvements in the methods used by the Stroybank in accordance with the possibilities which this system offers. The system includes a unified integrated data base which provides full and qualitative information on the financing and crediting of capital investments, the efficiency of their utilization, the development of the investment process and the economic and financial activities of customers, contractors and design-research organizations.

Therefore, today the USSR Stroybank deals with problems related to actively influencing the credit-account and financial mechanism for upgrading the efficiency of the investment process, ensuring full returns from capital investments, achieving high rates of production utilization of the latest scientific and technological discoveries, and efficient use of material, labor and financial resources in capital construction.

In its daily work on financing and crediting capital investments in the national economy of the USSR, the USSR Stroybank is steadily guided by the instructions of Comrade Yu. V. Andropov to the effect that today the main task is the planning and systematic implementation of measures which can provide great scope for the activities of the tremendous constructive forces inherent in our economy. These measures must be thoroughly prepared and realistic. Therefore, the laws governing the development of the socialist economic system must be firmly applied in their elaboration.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/18

BANK CREDIT: ECONOMIC INCENTIVES AND LEVERS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83) pp 53-59

[Article by Dr of Economic Sciences V. Rybin]

[Text] At the November 1982 Central Committee Plenum, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, pointed out that "a number of problems remain in the area of capital construction. We must continue our decisive struggle against the scattering of forces and facilities among a number of projects. We must increase the share of reconstruction and modernization and reduce the number of new construction projects. We are also largely dissatisfied with the organization of the construction system as well. The existing shortcomings in this area lead year after year to the nonfulfillment of plans for the commissioning of capacities.... Bringing order in capital construction is one of the main national economic tasks."

Completing the transition to a primarily intensive development and the prompt commissioning of productive capital and production facilities, and the concentration of funds on the most important construction projects largely depend on the efficiency with which the credit mechanism operates. Unfortunately, we cannot say that today it fully guides all participants toward the implementation of the necessary measures for enhancing the efficiency of capital investments. This calls for a more detailed discussion of some unresolved problems.

Economic levers such as loan repayment time and interest rates play a most important role in increasing the influence of the bank on the course of the investment process. So far, however, such levers are inadequately performing their stimulating role. They do not encourage with sufficient energy the prompt completion of projects and mastery of installed capacities.

For what length of time should bank loans be granted? Authors of economic articles frequently suggest, on the basis of the actual recovery of capital investments, that loans be issued for 8 or more years. Obviously, in this case bank loans seem to legitimize the existing practice of their slow utilization. It seems to us that the existence of average sectorial normed recovery periods should, naturally, be taken into consideration but systematically reviewed and reduced. It is precisely this which should determine the period of the loan. This means that whereas initially repayment time is somewhat increased (thus broadening the range of utilization of long-term credits), subsequently they should not exceed the current limits (5 years).

At the same time, it would be desirable to allow the granting of loans to enterprises which operate either on a planned loss or unprofitable basis if they can become normally profitable as a result of the credited measures.

As we know, the redemption time for credit investments is closely related to the time for mastering the installed production capacities. Currently our normative deadlines for mastering capacity are in effect differentiated by sector. The enterprises must reach planned technical and economic indicators within the planned deadlines. However, this circumstance is not taken fully into consideration in determining the recovery of outlays for new construction, for loans are usually repaid in equal installments and during the first and subsequent years of operating the project built with bank loans, which damages the cost-effective interests of the enterprises during their first years of operation. In our view, the newly completed projects should repay the loans in increasing amounts in accordance with the normative deadlines for reaching planned production capacity.

In 1980 the USSR Council of Ministers passed a decree on interest rates on bank loans. It stipulates that interest on loans granted by the USSR Sroynbank for construction, reconstruction and technical retooling of enterprises, within the limits of the state capital investments plan, would equal 1 percent if the projects are completed within the planned deadline; 0.5 percent if completed ahead of schedule; 2 percent if the deadline is violated and 5 percent in the case of delinquent payments. This indicates a substantial differentiation in interest rates.

Nevertheless, the possibilities for further energizing the interest rate policy with a view to increasing the influence of loans on investment process have not been exhausted.

Today, from time to time a situation develops in which the enterprise finds it more advantageous to extend the loan than to repay it promptly and to pay a 6 percent interest rate from part of its payment for assets. Obviously, the penalty rates must be made somewhat higher than payments for assets both in cases of extended loans and violations of stipulated construction deadlines. At the same time, the incentive role of the interest rates should be increased: some of the funds saved as a result of shortening the construction time should go to the material incentive fund of economic organizations. Conversely, additional outlays should be paid out of funds used for bonuses to managers and engineering and technical personnel who are mainly responsible for the elimination of difficulties which lead to the payment of higher interest rates. Naturally, sometimes such difficulties are totally unrelated to the work of the enterprise or construction project. Therefore, a number of stipulations should be applied, which would make it possible to avoid such penalties whenever pertinent or apply them within a limited range.

V. I. Lenin wrote that "the preventive significance of the penalty is not based in the least on its strictness but on its inevitability" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 4, p 412). The activities of an economic manager directly improve when he knows in advance that a strictly economic pressure will be inevitable.

Consequently, the task is not to interfere without necessity in the current autonomy of associations, plants and factories but, regulating on a centralized basis, individual exceptions from the principles of crediting, find in the area of credits and, particularly, the interest rate policy, the most accurate correlation between economic incentives and penalties in terms of an enterprise operating on a cost-effective basis and its individual workers, with a view to ensuring the full observance of the interests of the national economy. The bank organs can contribute flexibly, profoundly and purposefully to the implementation of the stipulation formulated in the materials of the 26th CPSU Congress: "Increasing the efficiency of economic penalties for nonimplementation of planned assignments and contractual obligations, and inefficient expenditure of material and financial resources."

The bank has in its arsenal a variety of measures of influence including depriving enterprises and organizations of credit. Such penalties are applied mainly in short-term credit relations with enterprises, associations and organizations. However, they are beginning to be used with increasing frequency in long-term credit relations as well. A set of strict measures may be applied in the case of poorly working contracting organizations which fail to fulfill planned assignments, such as transfer to a special crediting system (increasing the interest rate by 20 percent for the use of credits, interrupting the granting of some types of credit, total elimination of credits, recalling a loan ahead of schedule, and so on). Strict penalties are applied toward contracting organizations working at construction and other projects the financing of which has not been accepted. The purpose of such penalties is to motivate through specific economic means the managers of enterprises and construction projects and their superior organizations to take the necessary steps to improve economic and financial activities.

Thus, the Kemerovo office of the USSR Stroybank applied credit sanctions to six contracting organizations for mischanneling material-technical and manpower resources from leading construction projects and failing to fulfill their plans for construction and installation projects at particularly important construction sites and projects built with import equipment purchased on a compensation basis. This forced the organizations and their superior units to reorganize their work. As a result, six target complexes were completed at the Azot Production Association, the electric steel-smelting shop at the Zapadno-Sibirskiy Metallurgical Plant and capacities for the production of 2,300 tons of textile capron fibers at the Plant for Chemical Staples. Last year the Stroybank imposed credit penalties for taking resources away from target projects, affecting 820 contracting organizations of the USSR Ministry of Construction of Heavy Industry Enterprises, USSR Ministry of Industrial Construction, USSR Ministry of Construction and USSR Ministry of Construction in the Far East and the Transbaykal. To a certain extent this contributed to the fact that the number of unfinished important projects in 1982 declined by almost 40 percent compared with 1981.

This means that the banks have extensive specific possibilities of taking steps toward members of the investment cycle who fail to fulfill planned assignments, allow negligence and do not ensure the necessary efficiency of capital investments. Unfortunately, the USSR Stroybank offices do not always decide

to apply such penalties, particularly in the case of large construction projects, frequently limiting themselves to warnings or other ineffective measures (unwilling to "spoil" business relations, yielding to the pressure of local directive organs, and so on). It is only when the shortcomings increase and lead to serious breakdowns in the implementation of plans or to extensive inefficient and illegal outlays that the necessary measures of economic influence are applied.

Nor has a system of incentives in crediting properly working associations, factories, plants and construction projects been developed as yet. The current system includes only minor economic and organizational-administrative benefits and is inconsistent with the special system applied in crediting lagging enterprises. However, if the production collectives are aware that good work would bring them additional tangible advantages in crediting (in this respect, as we pointed out, a great deal could be accomplished by the further energizing of the interest rate policy), while violations and shortcomings would inevitably result in substantially harming their interests, the efficiency of the bank's influence would become even greater. Under such circumstances enterprises, associations and sectors would adopt a significantly stricter attitude in selecting the most efficient targets for production construction and reconstruction in the course of planning their capital investments. If the material incentive of bank offices are directly related to the efficiency of the loans they make, the control on their part would be strengthened as well (and, we repeat, possibilities for such influences are very substantial).

In 1981 the USSR Sroybank offices established cases of improper use of metal totaling 349,700 tons; misuse of another 300,000 tons was established in 1982 (90 percent of which appeared in the course of reviews of cost estimates). As a result of prompt measures, during the first years of the 11th Five-Year Plan the ineffective use of metal totaling 470,000 tons was prevented. The USSR Sroybank was awarded the Gold Medal of the USSR Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy for the successful application of the effective control system.

On the suggestion of the bank, the consumer ministries and departments deleted from the 1982 plan 5,297 construction and other projects with annual capital investment ceilings totaling 807 million rubles (for lack of cost estimate documentation, funds issued in violation of construction time norms, and so on). This made it possible to raise capital investment ceilings for 2,652 target projects and 397 construction projects for which equipment had either been procured or ordered. This accelerated the commissioning of productive capital (which increased 2.6 percent compared with 1981).

In order to detect violations in the course of the implementation of the plans more efficiently and impose penalties promptly, the USSR Sroybank offices are increasing their current control over the activities of the participants in the investment cycle. In 1981 they discovered open and concealed additional funds for wages in 8,830 organizations, totaling 79 million rubles. Credit sanctions were applied against 1,645 organizations for systematic wage overexpenditures; 1,082 cases of misuse were submitted to the

prosecutor's office and the people's control organs and unauthorized expenditures made by 5,125 officials were detected; more than 1.2 million rubles were withheld from their wages as partial compensation for damages caused, etc.

In 1982 information was sent to the USSR State Arbitration organs covering 4,300 construction projects, on the basis of which proceedings were initiated for 2,200 construction projects and fines totaling 354,600,000 rubles were levied from the culprits. These funds helped to install capacities at 795 construction projects with capital investment ceilings totaling 757,300,000 rubles. Figure paddings detected by the USSR Stroybank in 1982 resulted in the imposition of fines totaling 13,700,000 rubles; this includes 375,000 rubles withheld from specific individuals guilty of such figure padding.

In our view, however, the organizational influence of the bank on the participants in the investment cycle will be reduced in the future, compared with the economic influence. With the further development of crediting outlays for capital assets and the active use of bank loans for capital investments, the differentiated approach to enterprises and associations must become more extensively based on a unified policy for issuing and using short-, medium- and long-term credits. This will substantially broaden the bank's influence on the production units. This trend is consistent with the gradually developing role of the bank as an economic partner of ministries, associations and large enterprises in their financial and economic activities. In the developed socialist stage the role of the banks is not only to provide comprehensive economic aid to enterprises and associations in their efforts to enhance production efficiency and actively to stimulate through credits their business initiative, but to observe the course of their work on a daily basis without imposing any burdens on their partners and to apply economic sanctions whenever major shortcomings arise and decisive measures to eliminate irresponsibility are not taken.

The bank's influence will be exercised both in the course of the formulation of plans for capital investments and credits and their implementation. If a procedure is applied according to which requests submitted by enterprises and associations for loans (during the quarter and the year or, subsequently, possibly the five-year period) are accepted as a rule with the approval of the bank office servicing them (which is frequently well-familiar with the situation of its customers), it would become possible to determine more fully the possibilities of the production units and complexes, to find possibilities jointly and to earmark corresponding measures and define financial-credit sources for their implementation. In this manner the formulation of annual plans will begin from below, from the production associations, enterprises and organizations, with the direct participation of the bank as an equal economic partner. This procedure for the coordination of credit requests would have a positive influence on credit planning. It would enhance the substantiation of the plans for economic and social development formulated by enterprises, organizations and associations and would enable us substantially to improve the quality of territorial planning.

Budget, enterprise and long-term credit funds could have an efficient influence on the course of the investment cycle only if each one of them is used within strictly limited areas and without elements of subjectivism. Budget funds in particular should be applied only in the construction of projects of major national economic significance, which are of a programmatic and intersectorial nature and which shape the macroeconomic proportions in the development of the socialist economy. The use of enterprise funds (which currently finance more than 50 percent of capital investments) should be such as substantially to develop cost-effective principles of economic management and to interest enterprises in earning higher profits and directing a suitable percentage of them to technical improvements and radical expansion of production facilities and to enhance their responsibility for results of current activities and capital construction (reconstruction). Unfortunately, a significant percentage of enterprise funds in industry are still being taken from properly operating associations, plants and factories and redistributed within the sector. Clearly, it would be expedient to grant such enterprises the right to use such funds on a priority basis. Associations, plants and factories which either lack such funds or cannot accumulate them quickly should be financed essentially through long-term loans. This would ensure the optimal utilization of the various financial sources, lower the share of budget and enterprise funds in them and increase the share of long-term credits, which is consistent with the requirements of the 25th and 26th party congresses and CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decrees on improving the economic mechanism.

Based on the efficient coordination of sources for the formation of capital investments, it would be expedient to plan norms for the utilization of budget, enterprise and credit funds over a five-year period. At the same time, in our view, the effectiveness of control exercised by the USSR Gosbank, the USSR Srobybank in particular, over the balancing of material, manpower and financial resources allocated at all stages of the investment cycle and for ensuring the consistency between the plan the capacities of construction organizations and the length of construction and mastering of commissioned projects should be enhanced. Central and local bank organs should clearly participate also in projecting the effectiveness of planned capital investments for each individual project, check the accuracy and expediency of appropriation of such funds for new construction, reconstruction and technical retooling of production facilities and mechanization of manual processes, the share of which remains rather high (particularly important here is the role of long-term loans which could be made to enterprises, repayable over a period of 5-6 years, and the utilization of available material resources). In the course of the planning the bank authorities could determine the extent to which intensive factors of economic growth are used in drafting cost estimates and ensuring the better satisfaction of social requirements for one commodity or another, as well as the extent to which the latest achievements in scientific and technical progress are used in the course of design and construction work. Since inefficient "barter economy" has become widespread at enterprises (the share of tools produced at the specialized plants of the Ministry of Machine Tools and Tool-Building Industry accounts, according to estimates of sectorial institutes, for some 40 percent, no more than 3 percent of the entire amount of castings are produced on a centralized basis,

and so on), it would be expedient for the banks to see to it that the bulk of capital investments appropriated for this purpose is channeled into sectors which should meet such national requirements.

With a clear concept of their future development and specific information on their work plan for the five-year period, organizations, associations, plants, factories, and sectors, proceeding from the cost-effectiveness principles, should estimate in the course of their current activities and implement measures aimed at production intensification, restructuring and expansion based primarily on their own funds or bank loans (particularly if budget funds have been reduced to a minimum). In turn, on the basis of requests of their customers, the bank offices would determine the expediency and estimated efficiency of loans issued and loan stipulations. This would substantially improve the long-range nature of loans granted for the implementation of a system of measures for production intensification. It would improve the planning and stability of credit relations with the other participants in the investment process based on loan contracts. The bank would provide comprehensive financial assistance to economic organs which plan and take active steps for the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the better utilization of equipment, commodity and material values, secondary resources, metal waste and other materials and ensure the fastest possible lowering of the volume of unfinished construction. If no such measures are stipulated the bank would impose strict restrictions on current planned credit relations with the participants in the investment cycle.

The bank's influence would also become timely and efficient, for under the conditions for balancing various types of resources and better synchronizing the movement of commodity and material values and credits any major shortcomings in the production and economic activities of enterprises, organizations and associations in the course of the implementation of their construction programs would, as a rule, rapidly influence their financial results.

However, the efficient and comprehensive use of loan contracts presumes a substantial consolidation of credit relations. Since the number of cost-effective production units is being currently curtailed as a result of the creation of associations, the bank can now intensify its individual work with customers. Since the amount of work will increase and the study of data will become more complex, it is very important to equip bank offices with modern facilities and new-generation computers. This will enable the bank to process more efficiently the tremendous amount of data it receives in the course of crediting and settling accounts, covering various aspects of the activities of service enterprises and organizations, to systematize them and, if necessary, submit such data to interested organs promptly. This will create conditions for the various authorities in charge of supervisory functions substantially to reduce the number of investigations at enterprises and organizations on general matters of plan fulfillments and to reduce the occasions of involving their personnel in the submission of necessary data. Such investigations would be expedient essentially in clarifying specific aspects of activities and refining bank data.

This would substantially standardize the national economic control system, improve its organizational foundations and enhance the role of the banking

system in managing the country's economic life. This would also allow the USSR Gosbank and Stroybank to become, finally, in Lenin words, a unified apparatus for "nationwide bookkeeping" (see op. cit., vol 34, p 307).

Since all organizations which participate in the investment process should be equally interested in its acceleration and be held liable for any slowdown, it would be expedient to establish a direct correlation between bonuses to bank workers and the success with which loans and other financing sources for productive and working capital are used. The organization of such bonuses by the USSR Stroybank would become an element in the further development of cost-effective relations among all partners. In our view, each Stroybank office should set up a material incentive fund, which would be used instead of the current bonus system. The branch offices (oblast, kray and republic) should set up a centralized fund for sociocultural measures and housing construction and a centralized production development fund. It would be expedient to base such funds particularly on the successful utilization of the loans granted and to use centralized funds in improving the living and recreation conditions of bank workers.

Under socialist conditions the credit mechanism is the most important economic tool which contributes to the development of output and actively affects enterprise work. However, it is only by operating within an organized economic mechanism directed toward increasing output in the entire social production process that it could contribute to the solution of the task set by the 26th CPSU Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums of accelerating the investment process and upgrading the efficiency of capital investments.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/18

ON THE POLITICAL APPROACH TO ECONOMICS

PM221115 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83) pp 60-72

[Article by Dr of Economic Science P. Ignatovskiy, chief editor of PLANOVOYE KHOZYAYSTVO ; published as a basis for discussion]

[Text] The correlation between economics and politics is a question of the connection between the objective and the subjective in economics, the degree of influence that politics exerts on economics, the political approach to socialist management, and the methods of subordinating it to certain interests. This was expressed with special force at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum. Politics is always "present" wherever economic interests operate. And the latter are characteristic of the social strata and groups of any society. "...Interest is what links members of a civilian society together" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 2, p 134).

1

The particular feature of the link between economics and politics in a socialist society consists in the fact that social interest arises within the structure of interests. Social ownership relations would be impossible without this historically determined and objective condition.

"The revolution in ownership relations," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov stresses, "by no means boils down to a once-only act which turns the basic means of production into the property of all the people. Obtaining the right to be master and becoming the master--a real, wise and thrifty master--are by no means one and the same. A people who have carried out a socialist revolution still need a long time to assimilate--economically, politically, and, if you like, psychologically, by developing a collectivist consciousness and form of conduct--their new position as supreme and undivided owner of all of society's wealth."

This means that socialism's victory in the economy does not signify a similar complete victory in people's consciousness and in their attitude to labor, to social ownership itself, or to the social interest. Long and enormous efforts are needed if society is to develop and work its way to that victory.

That aim cannot be achieved without the influence of politics, which reflects the objective potential of social ownership, "enlivens" that potential, increases the force of its influence on people's consciousness, and shapes the

development of their conduct. It is politics and the political approach which predetermine the success of social efforts in the economic sphere, provided only that they reflect sufficiently correctly the requirements of the economic laws of socialism. That is why it is so important for the socialist state to maintain the objectively and historically conditioned correlation between economics and politics. It was to that aspect of social life under conditions of socialism that V. I. Lenin drew particular attention in the well-known conclusion that "politics cannot fail to have priority over economics. To argue otherwise is to ignore the fundamentals of Marxism" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 42, p 278).

The point is that interests, including social interests, cannot be realized by themselves. Thus Lenin's conclusion relates primarily to socialism and to its specific features--from the viewpoint of the role and place of the social interest in the structure of interests and of the methods of realizing it. All interests presuppose aims. Politics serves as an aim in relation to the social interest. The social interest does not overshadow personal or collective interests. The correlation between them is also ensured politically. This determines the priority of politics over economics.

But this paramountcy--from the viewpoint of interests--of politics over economics can only be implemented under two conditions: First, if policy is correct in terms of its content, that is, if it expresses the urgent requirements of social development; and second, if the process of implementing policy and of embodying it in life is the main and decisive process (when policy has been formulated).

The unity of theory and practice, that is, of the political and organizational activity of the communist party and the socialist state, lies in the combination of these two conditions of the implementation of the priority of politics over economics.

Noting the priority of politics over economics, Lenin did not allow the political approach to be supplanted by the economic approach. The political approach, meeting the interests of all society, expresses the specific nature of socialism; the economic approach, when it pushes to one side and sometimes even supplants the political approach, does not contain that specific nature and reduces the living cause of socialist building to a matter of commerce, narrow pragmatism, and sometimes even narrow group advantage. Warning against the possibility of such distortions, Lenin criticized Bukharin for confusing the political and economic approaches (ibid., p 278-279).

Unfortunately, the threat of such distortions has still not passed. It accompanies practice whenever a particular worker claims that he is implementing party policy and fulfilling congress and plenum decisions but is in fact losing his political bearings and political approach to matters, replacing it with all kinds of manipulation of figures and value indicators, and failing to provide the national economy with the output for whose sake the enterprise exists. But it would be a mistake to suppose that the political objective and, consequently, constant necessity by virtue of the fact that it alone has the ability to ensure the priority of the social interest.

Thus the correlation of politics and economics is not merely a slogan but a real condition of socialist management--the management of social production on the basis of policy and of a correct political approach. It is the political approach and the organization of matters in society's interests that resolve the fate of policy, that is, of what has been decided upon, and of the economy, that is, of that which determines the entire life of society. Its success is determined by the composition of cadres, their political insight and businesslike qualities, and the maturity of their economic thought. That is why, as Lenin put it, the link in question seemed to be as follows:

... Our main tasks in domestic and particularly in economic policy are changing. We do not need new decrees, new institutions, or new means of waging the struggle. We need to verify people's suitability, to verify actual execution. ... All the people who conduct all sorts of commissions, conferences and talks but fail to do the simple things would be better off moving into the sphere of propaganda, agitation, and other useful work. They put together something special and clever and justify themselves by saying that a new economic policy needs new ideas. But their assignment does not get done. They are not concerned with looking after the kopek that they have been given and do not try to turn it into 2 kopeks but instead compile plans for billions.... That is the evil that we will combat. Checking up on people and checking up on the actual execution of work--that again and that alone is the nub of all work and all policy at present" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Completed Collected Works], vol 45, p 16).

If economic cadres do not take care, in Lenin's words, to "look after the kopek that they have been given" and are not concerned with the social interest, there will be no trace of policy in the approach to matters. That is why it is necessary to verify the actual execution of matters if society and the state want to implement party policy. The heart of policy lies in the verification of execution.

Such a concrete and, at the same time, purposeful view of policy, a view designed to produce real results, must be of service to our present-day economic life. When the talk turns to some new improvement in economic policy, it must be confessed that although the appearance of the relevant documents is often followed by the appearance of new institutions and management links armed with substantial staffs, the real state of affairs changes little.

For example, a considerable effort has been made recently to utilize secondary resources. In addition to policy documents, new management formations have appeared but at the same time people still have nowhere to hand in their empty bottles. In the same way, old water pipes, gas ovens, scrap metal, and pieces of wood used to be and still are left scattered around on construction sites and vacant lots. Such facts simply undermine concrete political measures in the economy. It is here that verification of the real state of affairs will serve as a political approach by cadres to the state's interests. The approval of measures, funds, and posts, and the appointment of workers for these posts should be followed by verification.

"Of course, the right to 'approve' or 'disapprove' is always left to the official or to officials," Lenin noted ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 42, p 344).

But if this is to be understood rationally, the approval of a plan, for example, must be taken to include a number of orders and instructions: what to buy, when and where to buy it, what to begin building, and what materials to gather and to supply.

Developing this idea, Lenin stressed that it is possible in this way to achieve a reduction in bureaucracy and in transportation, the stimulation of production, and the improvement of working people's situation.

"Interpreting the term bureaucratically, 'approval' means petty tyranny on the part of officials, red tape, a pretense of verification commissions, in brief, the purely bureaucratic destruction of a living cause" (ibid). Such things still exist now and hinder the development of economic life. Actions of this kind, which form the standpoint of the essence of socialism and the interests of the state and society are apolitical, distort the correlation between economics and politics which rationally emerges and is maintained by the party, and essentially emasculate policy by implanting in the economy elements of spontaneity which are manifested in imbalances, losses of output and of the labor invested in it, and inequity in supplies in industry and the population.

These and other negative phenomena "cannot be combatted...merely by propaganda and agitation, merely by the organization of competition or by the selection of organizers," Lenin noted, "they must be combatted by means of coercion too" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 36, p 197). Strictly speaking, the latter is also a function of the state. Analyzing the state's functions Lenin stressed that "administration from above [administrirovaniye] and an administrative approach to matters are essential here" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 42, p 294).

Thus politics and the political approach to matters and their implementation are inseparable from administration from above--the state's organizational activity (including the necessary order and requisite exactingness). The combination of these aspects of the state's activity in the economy is the guarantee of the correct combination of economics and politics as prerequisites of our economic and social successes.

And it is precisely consistency, economic validity, and the firmness of state leadership of production processes--be they in industry, agriculture, construction, or transport--which they presuppose will ensure the necessary rhythm of economic life and the labor discipline necessary in and characteristic of all organized work.

But one must bear in mind that there are pitfalls for administrative activity in the economy and for the management in the shape of such distortions as bureaucratism, which is expressed in ignoring the needs of production, society, and labor collectives, and especially in holding up technical progress, the utilization of reserves, the attainment of higher labor productivity, and the thrifty use of resources. Without this, intensification of social production cannot be achieved.

And at present there is perhaps no more important social task, and consequently no more important social interest, than ensuring the transition of the entire national economy to the path of intensive development.

Economic policy and the political approach now aim at precisely the resolution of this task. And that means that in the practice of the leadership of the economy one must not confine oneself to registering the fact of plan fulfillment or nonfulfillment without looking into how intensive the plan was and at what price it was fulfilled. However, for the political approach to management even that is not sufficient.

In the shadow of the tremendous production potential created by Soviet people's labor, huge above-normative material resources and simply unneeded resources not required by a given production unit at times remain and build up. Such phenomena affect the productivity of all social labor and the intensiveness and efficiency of production.

In this context the following question serves as a yardstick of the political approach to the work of individual economic workers: What has additionally been brought into play? What increase in physical terms has been obtained in production? How has this benefited the state and the collective? Furthermore, economic workers must know how the cost of production is made up and what the idling of a machine tool, unit, tractor, or combine, the overexpenditure of raw materials, materials, and fuel, defective output, and production losses cost. The political approach, in order to bear fruit, can be based precisely on a course toward making matters specific and providing details that everybody can understand.

2

Polemics as to whether our society should step up the capital investment growth rate or reduce it, focusing all its attention on the better utilization of the existing potential, flare up and die down again in economic literature from time to time. Essentially, a trend toward a decline in the capital investment growth rate has become reality during the last two five-year plans. This was a reaction to the considerable volume of unfinished construction work. Now steps are being taken to bring this construction within the normative limits. But this is only one aspect of the problem. Besides speeding up the economic circulation of material resources, society must objectively ensure expanded reproduction, of which accumulations are the economic product. Capital investments are a form of the materialization of accumulation--according to F. Engels' definition, the most important progressive function of society. Society cannot curtail them since they serve as the basis of the technical improvement of production.

Our country at present has considerable accumulations at its disposal. Capital investments are a form of the materialization of accumulation--according to F. Engels' definition, the most important progressive function of society. Society cannot curtail them since they serve as the basis of the technical improvement of production.

Our country at present has considerable accumulations at its disposal. Capital investments in the national economy will total 144.8 billion rubles in 1983 and more than 700 billion rubles in the 11th Five-Year Plan as a whole. In contrast with the 10th Five-Year Plan it is furthermore planned that the national income growth rate should exceed the capital investment growth rate. That is a positive phenomenon.

The reduction in the share of capital investments must without fail be accompanied by an increase in their effectiveness, the improvement of social production itself, and an enhancement of its technical standard.

For a long time now, there has been talk of a shortage of capital investments, manpower, and material resources. Economic leaders constantly press for an increase in them, linking increased production with them alone. The solution of this question must also be approached from the standpoint of society's interests and needs. It is society's needs which must be considered above all when forming capital investments policy. At the same time, these needs themselves must be arranged according to the principle of priority. This is not a new factor in our planning. Now, I think, it is necessary to intensify political influence on the system of priorities within the economy. This presupposes changing the structure of capital investments and allocating them not to a sector as a whole but "to" a specific product and eliminating a shortage, that is, giving the structure greater purposefulness -- a politically defined set of priorities whose system implementation is socialism's most important advantage.

The consistent use of policy as a means of transferring our economy to new "coordinates" of development on the basis of the satisfaction of society's prime needs has at times been lacking from our planning and consequently from our management practice. After all, what is a plan? It is a political target given to labor collectives. The successful implementation of that target and the achievement of a substantial change in the economy and its development are only possible on the basis of an economic and political definition of the priorities of society's requirements and of the means of meeting them, primarily by making intensive use of production potential and material resources.

But the question may arise: If policy is able to ensure the progress of economic development comparatively easily, why has it not been possible to avoid difficulties in the satisfaction of production needs and of working people's individual needs?

I think that at one time the operation of policy within the economy was to a certain extent neutralized by the inadequate theoretical elaboration of economic measures--by an interpretation of those measures which curbed both economic and political factors. That was the only way that a situation could have arisen in which money was transformed from being the age-old means of exchange into the goal of enterprises' activity. The collective began to be interested in the sum of the money that had been earned, not in the satisfaction of society's needs, and the scale of that sum was turned into the basic criterion of "skillful" management. This deformation distorted the link

between the interests of the collective and society and weakened the political approach and its influence on production.

Such unforeseen consequences proved to be far-reaching--they exerted an adverse effect on the balanced nature, effectiveness, and ultimately the satisfaction of the needs of man and the national economy. It has still not been possible to formulate methods to overcome them which express the specific features of socialism.

In aggregate, certain difficulties in the economy, expressed in the change in attitudes to work, in the delay in switching to intensive methods of management, the depreciation of the role of qualitative indexes, the weakening of delivery discipline, insufficiently thrifty management, and the hunt for high prices and bonuses--sought even by means of the reduction of plan targets--confirm K. Marx's prediction, which has not been properly analyzed in the light of the real experience of socialist management: "...There can be nothing more erroneous and absurd than to propose control by united individuals over their aggregate production on the basis of exchange value and money..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 46, part I, pp 101-102).

Indeed, in the last 15 years it has become common in the national economy to get carried away with amounts of money, which have edged out the real products of labor in the assessment of enterprises' work: Value indexes--though necessary within the proper bounds--are objectively capable of weakening plan discipline, the socialist basis of a political approach to the economy.

Labor and not value is the basis of management, the basis of the economy. But until social production reaches a level of development where labor costs are measured directly, control--combining physical and value indicators--must be differentiated. In the production sphere, at the enterprise this must start with the physical accounting of labor costs (both live and embodied labor) which then moves on to value accounting and culminates at the highest level of the national economic structure in the generalized value indicators of global social product and national income, which are supplemented by physical indicators of material balances for the most important--particularly structural--types of products and also raw materials, fuel, and electricity.

The field of application of value indicators will narrow as the further socialization of production occurs. But even now the framework for the operation of economic control over the measure of labor, its costs, and its results is sufficiently mobile from the viewpoint of the combination of physical and value indexes. It is conditioned by the maturity of the forms of relationship between social and all other interests. Extremes here are harmful. Control must be real, according to the direct results.

"Even," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov writes, "when socialist production relations are definitively established, some people still preserve or else reproduce individualist habits and the desire to live at the expense of others and of society." This is why it is so important for us today to measure our economic machinery against the above-mentioned thesis of Marx and to ponder its warning about following the traditions of the classical monetary economy.

Here the role of politics is particularly great. A society based on public ownership and on the leading role of the nationwide interest--with a political vanguard of working people designed to not merely organize and run but also control activity in the production sphere--cannot rely only on monetary and value control. And though relations based on joint planned appropriation, disposal, and consumption play a leading role in our economy, old habits still weigh heavily on the consciousness of some producers. This is an obstruction. Hence difficulties such as the tenacity of old views of work and the desire to avoid the public interest, to grab more, and to evade control and responsibility to society. There are two possible ways to resolve this contradiction: either a return to market machinery, which is ruled out if we cherish the fate of socialism, or an increase in the conscious principle in the economy and an elevation in the role of politics, which defends truly socialist methods of management. The struggle for a socialist economic consciousness is a phenomenon with all the consequences and costs inherent in any struggle. It presupposes the will of the working class, determination, and state compulsion (coercion).

A struggle is a struggle. It presupposes politics and vice versa, that is, it must be conducted by political and organized means, ensuring the necessary atmosphere for efficacy.

To this end measures which at first sight may seem unadulterated administration from above are not ruled out--everything depends on the conditions, nature, and urgency of the planned measures. Political and administrative measures--even the toughest ones--operate as a single act, but this is not where their main significance lies. It is important for them to shape a political atmosphere in which changes in consciousness take place and in which it is impossible to disregard public matters and interests.

It must be noted by way of illustration that empty talk about variations in advantageousness [raznovygodnost] is damaging to the consciousness of economic cadres, the political atmosphere of management, and responsibility for satisfying society's needs, the--full--consequences of which are not even measurable.

3

Whenever it was a question of the interests of socialism, Lenin gave priority to principle-mindedness of political approach. Thus he wrote: "I limit myself to the political side of matters: We expel people unreservedly from the party for nonfulfillment of this. There must be no joking here" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 44, p 388). Those words were spoken in exceptional historical conditions. But if a sector leader does not ensure the safekeeping of state property, or after purchasing imported equipment does not utilize it for years, or having built a plant does not know how to load the capacities and staff that plant with workers, leniency is scarcely permissible even today.

In such cases only politics and a political approach should have an effect. For economic damage is irreplaceable when public time and social labor have been wasted and consequently economic growth and ultimately social progress

have been retarded. What "reparations" can be used to make this up? What is needed here are not value sanctions nor an illusory reimbursement of the damage in the form of monetary deductions--these are incapable of reimbursing society's irreversible loss of part of its store of work time and social labor. For this reason, what is needed primarily are people who strive to justify the trust of party and people, who are indeed politicians of socialist management, and who do not seek ways round politics, the state, and economic laws along the slippery paths of the downward amendment of plans, especially for the sake of unearned bonuses, additional payments, and inflated glory.

Lenin, stressing the role of the political factor in the economy, reiterated many times: "...the crux of the whole situation does not lie in resolutions, institutions, or reorganization. Since these are necessary to us, we will do these things, but don't bother the people with them: Choose the necessary people and check the practical execution--and the people will appreciate this" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 45, p 112).

No instructions can take the place of reliable, politically mature workers. If there is an unconscientious attitude toward management, the most ideal indicators will be unable to produce the desired results. Economic leaders who have embarked on the path of various value manipulations--marking up wholesale prices and overreporting (these actions are interrelated, distort the true situation in the economy, and make it possible to appropriate what has not been earned)--thereby lose the political trust of the party, the state, and working people. And the sooner party organizations and labor collectives rid the economic front of such manipulators, the healthier the atmosphere in every economic component will be. This is an important source for mobilizing the efforts of labor collectives to seek out and utilize production reserves so as to satisfy the people's requirements.

In resolving questions of improving the political situation in grassroots components of the national economy, it should be borne in mind that, as long as the reduction of the economy primarily to value results and assessments has been overcome in enterprises, policy in management--whether we want it or not--gives way to the pressure of money turnover and monetary interest which, by virtue of the acute contradictions inherent in them, will never be able to express the true aims of socialism.

A way out is possible by means of increasing, as determined by actual conditions, the impact of policy on the economy and enhancing the role of its vehicles--politically and professionally trained cadres capable of finding reserves for progress in a given production sector, ensuring a real increase in the product, and improving even the smallest concrete thing.

Consequently, it is not so much new principles of production management that are needed as people capable of implementing them under new conditions, with greater energy, unshakeable consistency, and progressive knowledge and experience, as demanded by the increasing degree of maturity of our economic relations, by modern production techniques and standards, and by increasingly complex labor cooperation.

Meanwhile, in the search for cardinal changes in the management of the economy, changes which it is now customary to call a machinery, proposals are sometimes put forward for the broader development of commodity-money relationships. "Romantic" hopes of discovering faultless economic indicators and equal advantageousness of output is unattainable under conditions of commodity-money relationships and the mobility of the production structure. Experience of management, particularly in the '60s and '70s, confirms this conclusion.

The difficulty consists in achieving on a daily basis the correct combination of economics and politics or, rather, in supporting economic tasks by means of an arsenal of political means; in preventing overestimation of the orientation toward either types of methods (economic or political), in correctly understanding the essence of economic categories, and in avoiding their identification with value categories. Unfortunately, such phenomena have occurred in the practice of management and have still not been overcome. To a certain extent political methods have had no luck. At one time political assessments, political measures of influence, a political approach to the matter, and all measures of the administrative and legal consolidation of economic ties and relations were regarded, plainly on the basis of a misunderstanding, as sheer, reprehensible administration from above--a result of bureaucracy. We did not manage without excesses and vacillations, when, for example, even an indicator such as labor productivity was excluded from the economic machinery. The qualitative measurement of results was confined to profit without a proper analysis of its origin.

As a result of underestimating the role of policy in the economy society encountered a tangible manifestation of a counterbalance to the interest of society such as departmentalism, which is inevitable under conditions of the need to use value indicators. Spreading departmentalism splinters the public interest and hampers the policy of utilizing the advantages of socialism in the economy. But it is impossible to remove this phenomenon totally from our economic life under conditions of commodity-money relationships. Therefore, Lenin's thesis retains its methodological significance: "This circumstance, in connection with the very pressing need to improve labor productivity and to ensure that every state enterprise does not make a loss and is profitable and in connection with inevitable departmental interest and the exaggeration of departmental zeal, inevitably gives rise to a certain opposition of interests between the working mass and the directors and managers of state enterprises or the departments to which they belong" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 44, p 343).

Lenin was writing about the contradictions of the transitional period, which had objective roots in the economic relationships of the socialist production sector in connection with the use of monetary methods of assessing the contribution of every producer and collective to social production and their share in the global social product. Since these roots are objective, they have not been eliminated. And if the growth of social labor productivity has slackened and the due increase in output has not occurred, as happened quite recently in individual sectors, while progress has been noted in monetary terms, then it is clear that a contradictoriness capable of affecting the efficiency of all social production is inherent in the nature of such assessment.

What is capable of smoothing it over is the principle of the priority of politics over economics, a principle which is also objectively "called upon" to counteract the manifestation of the said contradictoriness. But this principle can manifest itself only if state organs actively ensure the advantage of public interests in management and if departmentalism, which holds up the processes of the socialization of production, is curbed. Society incurs the most palpable material and moral losses at departmental meeting points.

At the present time, given the deformations of social ties caused by volume indicators of the assessment of enterprises' activity in monetary terms (non-fulfillment of the production plan in the prescribed range, violation of contractual obligations, violation of quality characteristics, overreporting, and so forth), the state, to counter departmentalism, is interested in indicators which directly express the real course of production. It is precisely deliveries, production of the prescribed range of output of the appropriate quality, and also the saving of resources that are now brought to the fore in characterizing the activity of an enterprise or sector. All kinds of interests are thereby ensured. Consequently, a political approach to the economy must be based on the premise that the delivery of actual products for the prescribed (normed) expenditure ensures the interests of society and of every member of society and satisfies their diverse requirements. This demand of the modern economic situation was reflected in the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers resolution on delivery discipline.

Departmentalism can be limited and suppressed by all measures--political, economic, legal. Its breeding ground is the swelling of the managerial apparatus in sectors, accompanied by red tape. These phenomena cannot be overcome by strengthening discipline and order only in enterprises and associations.

Departmentalism, like localism, hampers the strengthening of state and executive discipline and undermines the social foundations of socialist production. There are probably no other phenomena in our economic life which may be compared with departmentalism and localism in terms of the amount of damage which they cause to our economy's efficiency.

Lenin wrote: "The task of socialism lies in converting all the means of production into the property of all the people, and not at all in ships being transferred to shipworkers and banks to bank employees. If people take these trifles seriously, it will be necessary to abolish nationalization..." ("Pola. Sobr. Soch.," vol 35, p 411).

He saw the economic isolation of production collectives, sectors, and their interests as a distortion of the essence of socialism and emphasized that socialism would not be achieved by separating producers and replacing ownership of the means of production by all the people with ownership by individual professional groups of producers. A chain reaction of clashing interests would grow instead of a community of interests.

But even with social ownership of the means of production, the substitution of departmental interests for statewide interests is a deviation in practice

from socialist principles. In such cases the property of all the people is used for narrow group purposes, and society's interests are harmed in the sphere of both the siting and the use of production forces. The "supporters" of a departmental approach to the economy regard the property of all the people as the property of a narrow group and "forget" that the state has only entrusted them with the operational economic control of a certain part of its means of production in order to satisfy society's needs, and not for the sake of their illusory benefit.

The nature of departmentalism has not yet been fully revealed in literature, and until this is done it is not possible to root it out. For the time being, however, one thing is clear: The exaggeration of the role of group interests and group approaches to economic development is the source of this phenomenon. On the surface of economic life this phenomenon may be perceived as inevitable in the practice of managing a socialist economy. Attempts have therefore constantly been made to step up ministerial financial autonomy.

Thus departmentalism constitutes an extraeconomic isolation of group interests in the economy which has objective preconditions. It is principally opposed by social ownership and the interest this creates, as well as by the policy according with that interest both in the sphere of resources allocation and in the evaluation of the work of sectorial management components from the standpoint of the political approach and of elucidating the conformity of the activity with social interests.

At the same time it is important to bear in mind that a sectorial interest only bears the mark of departmentalism to the extent that it is a department which accumulates it, but their content [the content of sectorial interest and departmentalism] does not coincide. A sector's natural interest is realized in its enterprises via the production of the material wealth that society needs.

If a sector fails to satisfy society's needs and does not fulfill the production plan, and its management component attempts to obtain a reduction and downward adjustment of the plans and does not ensure full use of production capacities, this practice is a distortion of the essence of the sector's interest and, as already noted, is a distortion of the essence of socialist economic relations. A department's initiative on the question of adjusting the plans--that is, lowering them, as it were, in the sector's interest--which essentially means "adapting" the plans to the actual production level achieved undermines the foundations of the planning system and emasculates the essence of the plans and their mobilizing influence on production.

Departmentalism is very perceptible in the resolution of intersectorial problems, which represent national economic and statewide goals and interests to the greatest extent. This principally affects the use of natural resources and manpower, as well as the country's whole scientific, technical, and production potential. It is well-known that the need for production units of pan-sectorial significance is increasing in the national economy. There is the production of castings, hardware, and tools, the carrying out of maintenance, the shipment of freight, and so forth. Departmental barriers considerably hamper this process.

As we can see, the manifestations of departmentalism are various, but sometimes facts of a different kind are taken for them. I refer to the fact that individual workers in ministries and departments duck out of deciding a sector's economic, political, social, and organizational questions and refuse to take vigorous action on the pretext that it "does not concern us"--that is, they show a lack of initiative and an inability or disinclination to work efficiently and flexibly. Here it is a case not of departmentalism, but of conservatism and a bureaucratic attitude to work. In these conditions responsibility for the fate of social production and for social progress declines.

The danger of departmentalism from the political and ideological viewpoints is great, since the essence of socialist efficiency and the spirit of communist ideology in the relations between people and economic organizations is replaced by a spirit of isolationism, communal and group narrow-mindedness, and disregard for social needs for the sake of narrow sectorial, transient, and, from society's viewpoint, nonessential prospects for developing society's needs and the conditions for satisfying them.

It exerts a deleterious influence on the mentality of people who are called upon to defend and implement statewide interests, intensifies phenomena of spontaneity in social development, deforms the relations of people in the spheres of production, distribution, and exchange, works against the systematic approach, and weakens the foundations of the socialist economy and its monolithic character. It is essential, therefore, to mobilize the whole mighty arsenal of political means, especially broad social and state control, against it.

Departmentalism is accompanied by localism. Localism is not an essential phenomenon of the socialist economy. Although the national economy as a socially determined system of production is formed in grassroots units of society--in enterprises, that is, at local level--nevertheless production is social. So it is not in the localization [mestnaya adresnost] of production that localism finds expression. It manifests itself in the approach to production and in the methods of carrying it out, namely: in the replacement of the statewide interest of all the people by regionalist and local territorial interests. This represents a deviation from economic strategy, especially in the siting of production forces, a deviation from society's economic requirements, and a deviation from the tasks of social progress. Localism is at variance with centralism and the development of democracy, in the socialist meaning of the word.

Localism, like departmentalism, runs counter to the Leninist principle of control--control by all the people over the course of production, distribution, exchange, and consumption. It is particularly impermissible in conditions of developed socialism, when the process of internationalizing the economy and all spheres of social life is intensifying and the union of all the USSR's nations and ethnic groups, whose economic foundation is the integrated national economic complex, is strengthening.

Predicting these processes of the emergence and development of the new social formation, Marx wrote that "an organic system as a total whole has its own

prerequisites, and its development toward integrity lies precisely in subordinating all society's elements to itself or creating from society the organs which the system still lacks. It is in this way that a system is transformed into an integrated whole in the course of historical development" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 46, part I, p 229).

It is precisely the integrated nature, as a feature of the economic base and the whole social system, which constitutes the qualitative characteristic of a developed socialist society. Therefore, the emergence of ideas about applying the principles of financial autonomy in relations between union republics cannot fail to cause surprise. Essentially it is a matter of isolating the economic interests of the Soviet republics, which have entered into a political and economic union based on a united historical and social goal--the building of a communist society. After all, one cannot fail to see the contradictory nature of value relations, with their inherent tendency toward isolating the opposing producers' interests rather than uniting them. Naturally, the plan localizes these contradictions, but it cannot completely remove them. The transfer of union republics and ministries to financial autonomy would organically contradict the objective integrity of the socialist economy and the level of correlation between economics and politics which are characteristic of mature socialism.

"The interests of the republics are becoming increasingly closely interwoven," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov has said, "and the mutual assistance and interconnections which direct the creative efforts of the Soviet Union's nations and ethnic groups into a single channel are becoming increasingly fruitful. The comprehensive development of each socialist nation in our country leads objectively to their increasing rapprochement."

In socialist reality there is not a sufficient basis for the isolation of state enterprises, let alone of economic regions and sectors. The socialist economy is an integrated economic system, an integrated association of producers in the interests of all society. Thus there is no objective basis for money relations in the implementation of ties between republics within the state, with the elements of spontaneity characteristic of those relations--a spontaneity contrary to nationwide labor cooperation and the integrated planned system of production ties and production relations.

Localism is manifested primarily in disregard of the plan for deliveries to the union stock, in the diversion of capital investment resources to non-plan aims, in the delaying of the handover of construction projects by willful interference in the organization of construction work, and in the incomplete use of local resources. In other words, localism is expressed in an underestimation of society's needs and interests and in setting local-level measures at odds with statewide measures. The CPSU Central Committee November (1979) Plenum, for example, noted that not only mistakes and localism but also instances of patent arbitrariness have been permitted in construction work. It was stressed that it is incumbent upon party committees to resolutely suppress the embezzlement of capital investments and the diversion of manpower and materials from important state projects. This is a clearly expressed manifestation of localism which is immediately recognizable. It does not

require great efforts to overcome such phenomena if state, plan, and executive discipline are strengthened. In this respect it is important either to assign particular workers to order or to select cadres who are conscientious and reliable from the viewpoint of the unity of political and business qualities.

At the same time the attitude of some personnel showed a more subtle manifestation of localism, hidden from "outside" eyes, whereby steps were not taken to expand the production of, for example, poultry or fish products or consumer goods on the basis of local resources and whereby a lack of initiative and a reluctance to show activeness gained the upper hand. That atmosphere gave rise to a particular type of worker who found it most advantageous to do nothing to mobilize reserves, to make economical use of local resources and production waste, and to intensify production.

Localism is incompatible with socialist initiative and with the directly social character of our production. The nature of the social system rejects it, and in practice it is opposed by the party's political platform and organizational measures, which help to strengthen the unity of the interests of all society. And it is in this that the paramount role of policy is shown. The party not only proclaims but also truly creates the conditions for the development of local initiative. It was to this end that a law was adopted to broaden the rights of the local soviets. The party considers that the broadening of the rights of the local organs of Soviet power, like the strengthening of the operational and economic independence of enterprises and associations, as Comrade Yu. V. Andropov stressed at the CPSU Central Committee November ('982) Plenum, and the adoption of the Law on Labor Collectives effectively reduce the scope for localism and departmentalism. The real solution of this question depends on management practice and on the specific activity of the cadres of production organizers, that is, on subjective factors which presuppose social and state control and the analysis and identification of measures to bring local practice into line with social interests.

If lip service is paid to acknowledging the prime significance of state interests but in practice the timely commissioning of projects of state significance is not ensured and in some places crops, livestock numbers, fuel, allied grain, procured fodder, and meat, milk, and egg yields are not accounted for accurately, and if an increase in the marketability of agricultural production via the sale of such products to the state in accordance with the plans is not ensured, then the real material conditions for safeguarding society's interests are not created, and in such instances it is hard to counteract localism. Thus life has confirmed the dialectic of Lenin's conclusion about the paramountcy of politics over economics. In taking into account the objective processes of socialism, policy not only reflects the basic thrust of the economy's growth and the objective requirements of social development but, in conjunction with good organization, helps to create the conditions for the kind of management which corresponds to socialism's essence as fully as possible.

СОР/8(48): Издател'sтво ТСК КПСС "Правда". "Коммунист", 1983

1980: 1802/18

COMMUNISTS' INTERNATIONAL ROSTRUM

Moscow KOMMUNIST In Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83) pp 73-82

[On the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the journal PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM]

[Text] PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, the theoretical and information journal of communist and worker parties, the first issue which was put out in September 1958 has been published for the past quarter of a century on a monthly basis.

The 300 issues published by the journal since then are a chronicle of a significant period in our age, born of the Great October Revolution, when the new social system reached its stage of maturity, and a new international community--the world socialist commonwealth--was established, and when the positions of the international communist movement strengthened considerably, the imperialist colonial system collapsed and more than 100 independent countries which, as a whole, are pursuing an anti-imperialist policy, appeared in its place. The ratio between social and political forces in the world arena changed in favor of peace, democracy and socialism under the combined influence of these processes.

The historical panorama of these changes, as shown in the journal, which substantially renovated the sociopolitical aspect of the world over the past 25 years, consists of thousands of analytical and information materials which not only reflect current events but interpret them from the viewpoint of the revolutionary worker movement and help the reader to assume the position of an active fighter for the cause of peace and social progress.

Every issue of PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is an act of cooperation among communists from many countries and the result of the efforts of a large international collective of authors and editors. It is an implementation of the task set for them by the fraternal parties of contributing to the contacts existing among communist parties in theoretical work, the joint interpretation of new problems facing the communist movement and exchanging experience in party construction, information and views on problems of the struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

The journal's activities reflect a trend toward expanding the social and political areas of the dissemination and application of revolutionary theory. Actively implementing the task traditional to the proletarian press of combining scientific socialism with the worker movement, it also contributes to

the dissemination of Marxist-Leninist ideology in the nonproletarian trends of the global revolutionary process. The authors and readers of PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM participate not only in the worker but in the various types of democratic, national liberation and anti-imperialist movements.

The journal has published articles by leaders and leading personalities of virtually all communist and worker parties in the world, Marxist scientists from many countries and leaders of international and national democratic organizations and movements—a truly universal aktiv of authors. During all this time the CPSU, one of the founding parties of problems of peace and socialism, has closely cooperated with the journal. The journal has regularly published articles by leaders of our party, state and public personalities, and Soviet scientists who have provided studies of major conceptual and political problems and various aspects of the experience in building a new society in the USSR and on the international situation.

The conference of representatives of communist and worker parties which organized the publication of problems of peace and socialism, which was held in Prague in March in 1958, stipulated that any fraternal party could participate in its publication. The systematic expression of the interests and objectives of the communist and worker movements, loyalty to revolutionary theory and to the ideals of proletarian solidarity and the collective practical experience of the journal have contributed to the steady increase in the number of these parties. Whereas 20 communist and worker parties took part in its founding, today the number of parties directly represented in the journal has reached 65.

The development of the theoretical cooperation among communist parties in the journal follows above all the line of creative research which leads to the assimilation of the comprehensive experience of the struggle waged by the working class and working people of different countries on the national and international levels. This research is based on an extensive international foundation. One way or another it involves all parties directly represented in the journal. Furthermore, another 20 communist and worker parties and some of revolutionary-democratic and national liberation movements and organizations have creative ties with the editors in a variety of manners. During its existence the journal's field of vision has covered more than 100 countries. In other words, its work is a confirmation of Lenin's thesis to the effect that revolutionary theory "grows from the totality of the revolutionary experience and revolutionary thinking of all countries in the world" ("Pisma. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 27, p 11).

Life continuously faces the journal with new questions and increasingly complex problems. It demands the interpretation of the features of occurring social processes. The current historical period in the life of mankind, as Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, emphasized at the June 1981 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, is "noted by a confrontation between two totally opposite outlooks and political courses--socialism and imperialism--unparalleled in the postwar period in terms of intensiveness and gravity. A struggle is being waged for the minds and hearts of billions of people on earth and the future of mankind largely depends on the outcome of this ideological struggle."

by summing up the tremendous variety of ways and means of struggle based on the specific conditions prevailing in the individual countries and which, in their totality, account for the universal experience of the antiwar, anti-imperialist, national liberation and revolutionary movements, the journal's authors and editors try to be in step with the times and sensitively to react to the beat of their social pulse and to changing political circumstances. Thanks to this, PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM presents such activities as a living and dynamic process which reflects the complex dialectics of contemporary global developments. This is a natural fact, for the journal's ideological base is the great doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The revolutionary theory of the working class not only determines the ideological-political aspect of the journal but itself is an object of research in a number of articles on its relevance and effectiveness today and the study of the role and place of Marxism-Leninism in the revolutionary process and the life of modern society. This was the topic of the cycle of articles on "Marxism One Hundred Years After Marx," the publication of which was undertaken in 1981 in connection with the 165th anniversary of the birth and the centennial of the death of the founder of scientific socialism.

As during Marx's life, today the development of a socialist awareness among the masses and revolutionary theory are taking place in the course of an acute struggle against the ideological opponents of scientific socialism. We know that they focus their main efforts on proving "the obsolescence" of the revolutionary doctrine and its "inapplicability" under contemporary conditions. While occasionally admitting that for a while social reorganizations were more or less consistent with the stipulations of this theory, some of its interpreters allege that today mankind faces problems which it cannot answer.

The articles within this cycle and many others substantively prove that the theory developed by Marx offers a key to the understanding of the basic problems of social development. Naturally, the development of society steadily formulates new questions. The specific picture of global developments is becoming increasingly varied. The forms of class struggle and national liberation movements and of global social progress as a whole are changing. However, this does not mean in the least that the new problems are not subject to Marxist-Leninist study. Quite the opposite: it is only from the positions of creative Marxism-Leninism that they could be understood accurately. E. Wenzel, SED Central Committee general secretary and GDR State Council chairman, writes that "in both the socialist and capitalist countries every single day brings new confirmation to the effect that Marxism is a living doctrine which has not lost its attractiveness in the least. Even serious bourgeois philosophers and economists, in presenting their views of the past, the present and the future of mankind, cannot ignore Marx. Even political leaders who claim that Marx is of no use to them are forced to acknowledge that the contemporary age puts on the agenda a number of questions which cannot be satisfactorily answered without turning to Marx" (No 6, 1981, p.14).

The journal's materials expose the groundlessness of the various attempts to undermine the integrity of the revolutionary doctrine of the working class,

to pit Lenin against Marx and to depict Leninism as a strictly "Russian phenomenon." An entire series of articles and other materials proved the tremendous theoretical potential and revolutionary power of Leninism, rooted in the fact that, as it develops as the organic extension of Marxism, it has expressed the requirements of global social progress and ideologically armed the working class and all working people in the struggle for the socialist ideals in an age when conditions for a conversion from capitalism to socialism have ripened. As developed by Lenin, Marxism is "a profound scientific summation of the overall revolutionary experience of the proletariat of all countries as well as the successful creative utilization of this international experience on the basis of general laws and principles and in accordance with the national and specific historical features of the individual countries. M. O'Reardon, Irish Communist Party secretary general, notes that "one of the outstanding features of Leninism is precisely that it covers in its summation on a universal-historical scale and takes into consideration the specific varieties of social practices of mankind under 20th-century conditions. The power of Lenin's doctrine lies in the fact that it shows the basic laws of social development today, for which reason it has retained its entire scientific depth and accuracy regardless of changes and turns in the socio-political destinies of individual countries and the world at large" (No 4, 1984, p 21).

Not only articles especially dealing with Lenin but, essentially, the entire comprehensive content of the journal over the past 25 years unquestionably prove that today it is impossible to understand properly the development of the new communist civilization, the dynamics of change in the nonsocialist part of the world, the nature of contradictions between the two social systems and the basic trends of development of the international situation without Leninism, not to say despite it. The accuracy of this conclusion is confirmed with particular clarity by the main problem of our time--the problem of peace.

FORUMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM began its publication during the cold war. In September 1958, in presenting the political credo of the new publication, the editors emphasized that its most important and urgent task was to reveal the aggressive forces of imperialism which were threatening mankind with nuclear war (see No 1, 1958, p 5). During the 25 years which followed, the world repeatedly came close to the threshold of nuclear catastrophe. It experienced freezes and thaws in international relations and, in the 1970s, a period of relatively stable detente and, in recent years, a drastic worsening of the global situation as a result of the energizing of the aggressive imperialist circles, American above all. The problem of war and peace has acquired a number of new facets, and possibilities for its political solution unknown in the past have become apparent. However, as the journal shows, during these years the fraternal parties see, as in the past, the possibility of its historical solution exclusively as indicated by Lenin's concept of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems. Their opinion, which as we know is shared by the peace-loving forces on earth, unanimously asserts that no other possibility exists.

The problems of the struggle for peace have always held a leading position in the journal. Never before, however, has the journal paid such great attention to them or formulated them so urgently as of late. This is understandable, for the threat of the total destruction of mankind and all life on earth has never been so real or realized so profoundly as it is today. Antiwar problems are extensively discussed in each issue and in virtually all types of materials used in the journal, ranging from articles and reports on an international symposium to interviews, comments, reviews and references. Using specific facts, their authors expose the aggressive nature of imperialist policy, describe to the broad readership the significance of the peace initiatives of the members of the socialist commonwealth and propagandize the ideas of the communists, the most consistent fighters for peace, imbued with concern for the destinies of mankind. The range of the antiwar materials published in the journal covers virtually the entire planet. The journal extensively covers preparations for and holding of a number of actions by the international antiwar movement, including the large universal assembly "For Peace and Life and Against Nuclear War," which was held in Prague in June 1981.

Although fully aware of the scale of the threat presented by imperialist policy today, the journal's authors nevertheless optimistically assess the possibilities of the peace-loving forces which oppose it. G. Husak, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee general secretary and Czechoslovak president, writes that "the danger to the world of the policy pursued by the current U.S. administration and its supporters in other imperialist countries must not be underestimated. At the same time, however, we must strengthen the conviction of the broadest possible popular masses and global public opinion and anyone who realizes the danger which a nuclear war presents to civilization on earth and to the very life of mankind, that the time has long passed when imperialism could arbitrarily control everyone's fate. Whereas in the past there were no forces capable of preventing a war launched by those who would profit from it and who deemed it advantageous, today the situation is radically different. Today the warmongers are opposed by the socialist commonwealth, the national liberation movement and powerful social forces in a number of countries. The struggle for peace and the prevention of a military conflict rests on broad and firm foundations" (No 6, 1983, pp 3-4).

A number of articles rate highly the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and prove the total groundlessness of the concept disseminated by bourgeois propaganda of "equal responsibility" of the United States and the USSR for the aggravation of international tension. F. Muri, Austrian Communist Party chairman, emphasizes in this connection that "the masses must be made to realize the true source of the threat of war. Today anticommunist propaganda finds it more difficult to claim that it originates in the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, we frequently come across the misconception that there is no substantial difference in this respect between the United States, the imperialist great power, and the Soviet Union, the socialist great power, and that both of them are threats to the world. The peace policy of the USSR tremendously helps in refuting this current main argument of anti-Soviet propaganda. The Soviet Union has formulated a number of initiatives and is steadily submitting ever-new constructive proposals in the field of strategic

armaments and medium-range nuclear missiles and in the area of conventional armaments" (No 3, 1983, pp 23-24).

Both Journal authors and editors not only try to depict the political and ideological aspects of the struggle for peace but to link it more tightly to the struggle against capitalism and to show the way the objectives and methods of the peace movement are refracted in the awareness of the various social groups and the prerequisites for the development of a mass antiwar front are taken into consideration. Under contemporary conditions, the heads of the communist parties in capitalist countries ascribe particular importance in their articles to the consolidation of peace-loving forces. Thus, Dr. Kiriaki, Communist Party of Greece Central Committee secretary general, writes that "one of the party's main tasks is, as it works among the people in a spirit of unity and frankness, to surmount on the basis of common objectives the obstacles which are facing the struggle for peace and are determined by political or ideological differences, manifestations of inertia, a passive attitude or else trends toward subordinating the antiwar movement to strictly party interests" (No 5, 1983, p 41).

The consistent defense of the interests of the communist movement and class principle-mindedness not only does not block the journal from cooperating with peace-loving and democratic forces of different ideological-political persuasions but, conversely, presumes such cooperation. Articles are carried by *PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM* written by social democrats and members of political movements and other social forces related to the communists by a common interest in putting an end to the arms race, eliminating hunger and poverty on earth, protecting the environment and resolving other grave universal problems.

The article "A United Front Against Missiles!," which was published in the July 1983 issue, is indicative in this respect. It consists of an exchange of views among West German fighters for peace of different persuasions, ranging from a communist to an evangelical theologian. In this discussion, other similar materials reflect the exceptionally characteristic, complex and sometimes contradictory nature of the contemporary peace movement which rallies dozens of millions of people of all possible political, conceptual and religious views.

The materials published in the journal convincingly prove also that the increasing danger of a destructive nuclear cataclysm pushes into the background differences on individual problems. In order to resolve the most important problem of today--defeating the plans for the deployment of new American nuclear first-strike missiles in Western Europe and blocking one more round in the arms race and lighting the missile fuse of a world war, the unity of action of all those rallied by the natural desire of preserving life on earth is necessary. The presentation of this task in connection with a study of social contradictions and the class struggle means contributing to its better understanding by the participants in the antiwar movement and making an important contribution to the unification of peace-loving forces.

For the past quarter of a century PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM has extensively discussed problems of the development of real socialism, and the common and specific features of the building of socialism in the different countries; it has analyzed its accomplishments, problems and difficulties. The development of a new system is presented as a creative process, the successful development of which depends above all on the systematic fulfillment by the working class and the ruling communist parties of their leading role in society. The journal also emphasizes that this process is based on objective laws the effect of which makes it irreversible and involves an increasing number of new countries.

As we know, the opponents of real socialism are frequently trying to defame it through the distortion of the real reasons for the difficulties which arise in the course of building the new society. They blame all shortcomings on the socialist system itself and try to present their manifestation as objective laws and principles of the socialist system, thus discrediting it in the eyes of the popular masses. In criticizing such evaluations, the journal's authors do not depict the building of socialism in a rosy coloring in the least. The path of development of the new society is not smooth. Along with natural growth difficulties, it faces obstacles triggered by the sharp class confrontation with imperialism, which, using a variety of economic, political, military and ideological means, tries to weaken the socialist world. Nor is socialism insured against subjective errors and blunders. In pointing out one of the reasons which create them, N. Stefanov, Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee member, points out that "we must also take into consideration the fact that socialism is historically relatively young, for which reason its society has not as yet acquired sufficient experience in consciously controlling the processes developing within it" (No 5, 1983, p 55). The objective study of problems of socialist construction found in many articles proves that it is precisely such factors rather than internal laws governing the development of socialism which are the base for the difficulties arising in its path.

Checking domestic practices in building the new society against historical experience of its construction in the USSR has long developed into a tradition for the authors from the fraternal socialist countries. Yu. Tsendenbal, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the Presidium of the Great People's Hural, points out that "to us, Mongolian communists, as to the revolutionaries the world over, the experience of the Great October Revolution and the CPSU is particularly important. Why? First of all, because this was an experience which developed in a multinational and economically mixed country, whose social system before the October Revolution was distinguished by features characteristic of the social development of many nations throughout the world, including ours, while the liberation movement developed in accordance with the general laws governing the world revolutionary process. Secondly, the October Revolution and the building of socialism in a multinational state acquired, by virtue of historical conditions, the type of ways, means and directions in the struggle which, one way or another, are consistent with the vital needs of the revolutionary movements in different countries. Thirdly, guided by the Leninist party, the Soviet people remain in the vanguard of social progress, steadily

enriching revolutionary theory and practice in the course of building communism" (No 11, 1982, p 7). In noting these factors, the author draws attention to the groundlessness of any attempts at depicting the dissemination of the experience of the USSR as the implantation of the "Soviet model" in other countries. "Mongolia," he writes, "is one of the socialist countries the development of which was maximally influenced by Soviet experience. However, no one imposed it upon us. We learned and are learning from the lessons of the October Revolution because they help us to become more profoundly familiar with the laws governing the building of socialism and struggle successfully for building a new society which does not reproduce a specific model in the least but which appeared and is developing in accordance with original forms triggered by the revolutionary creativity of our people" (ibid.).

The question of the correlation between the general and the specific in the development of the socialist society is extensively and regularly discussed at international conferences and symposia sponsored by the journal, reports of which are published in the journal, and in theoretical articles. The common idea in all such discussions is that there neither is nor could there be a system which could define in advance in all details the nature of the socialist society which is about to appear as a result of the independent revolutionary creativity of the broadest possible people's masses; however, despite this entire variety of specific, characteristic and unique forms and manifestations of this process, they are based on a number of common laws which include, above all, public ownership of productive capital and replacing the bourgeois state with a system of popular rule, which was precisely what was achieved as a result of the October Revolution in the USSR and was born of the social practices of the other countries of real socialism.

As emphasized in many of the articles, socialism is continuing its progress and is increasingly influencing through its peaceful policy and example of just organization of society the profound global processes and the situation in the capitalist countries. W. Kashtan, Canadian Communist Party secretary general, points out that "the force of the example of real socialism multiplies in connection with the intensified capitalist crisis and the aggravation of social problems triggered by this system, on the one hand, and the increasingly full and comprehensive revelation of the advantages of the mature socialist society, on the other. The nature of these opposite social principles of prime importance in politics is becoming increasingly clear and obvious to the nations: the capitalist principle of 'everything for the sake of profit' is countered by the socialist principle 'everything for the sake of man, for his well-being'" (No 10, 1980, p 4).

The communist and worker parties in the industrially developed capitalist countries make extensive use of the journal in studying the laws and characteristics of the class struggle under the conditions of the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism and the means and methods of revolutionary change and problems related to the role of the communists in mass movements. The now-chronic crisis upheavals intensify the economic and political destabilizing of capitalism and lead to the aggravation of the class struggle and the enhancement of the antimonopoly actions of the working people. The study of these phenomena proves that the process of the ripening of objective

and subjective prerequisites for the reorganization of the bourgeois society continues to intensify. However, state-monopoly capitalism retains important reserves for the protection of its positions. The journal's publications on the characteristics of development of contemporary capitalism enable us to trace the improvements in the mechanism of the class domination by the monopoly bourgeoisie over the past 25 years, the manner in which this mechanism has adapted to changing circumstances and the way in which the bourgeoisie has increased its arsenal of means and methods of struggle against the labor movement.

In describing the extensive possibilities in the development of the anti-monopoly struggle and the significant difficulties on its way, the authors analyze the crisis processes in the capitalist world and describe in specific terms the democratic socioeconomic and political alternative presented by the communists in countering the policies of the ruling classes. Their articles cover practical problems which arise in the daily work of the party members in developed capitalist countries and the activities of the parties in enterprises and among the unemployed; they study the new phenomena in strikes and the interconnection between the arms race and the curtailment of appropriations for social needs.

The journal extensively covers the views of the fraternal parties in the creation of class alliances between the revolutionary worker movement and the broad toiling strata in town and country on the basis of antimonopoly and democratic requirements. The political solution of this problem--the development of antimonopoly unity--is interpreted in a number of articles as a dynamic multiple-stage process. It is based on a platform of immediate requirements which most closely coincide with other already realized democratic sociopolitical trends developed on the basis of personal experience. However, substantial differences may separate the participants in such alliances in matters of longer-range objectives. In this connection, the materials of the international scientific seminar on "The Problem of Hegemony and Power. The State and Society" conclude that "...the unity of political forces opposing the system of state-monopoly rule is developed by surmounting contradictions and includes internal contradictions itself. These forces are linked within the framework of unity while retaining their special group interests. Therefore, the need arises for a stable yet sufficiently flexible consideration of the complex and contradictory dialectics of variety and unity. This problem becomes crucial in terms of the democratic and revolutionary process in the capitalist world" (No 2, 1983, p 49).

Problems of the international solidarity among the fraternal parties and their cooperation play a particular role in the journal's creative efforts. The main features of the materials in this area are the objective law of the interconnection among communists, the internationalization of revolutionary experience, the correlation between the national and the international in party life, class principles and norms of interparty cooperation developed through political practice.

Many of the journal's writers emphasize that under the present circumstances the increased role of internationalism is based on the imperialists' attempts

to organize an international "crusade" against socialism and the revolutionary and democratic forces by the reaction. H. Mies, German Communist Party chairman, writes that "the increasing aspiration of world imperialism toward closer coordination of strategy and tactics in the struggle against the socialist forces is considered by the German Communist Party a serious challenge hurled at the communists in all countries. We believe that this challenge should be answered by strengthening the unity and solidarity within our movement, so that in the 9th decade of the 20th century as well the ratio of forces on earth continue to change in favor of peace and socialism" (No 2, 1981, p. 21).

One of the leading trends in the journal's work is to cover problems of the anti-imperialist and national liberation movement in Asia and Africa and in the Latin American countries. Here the revolutionary changes are acquiring an anti-capitalist nature. In a number of countries with a socialist orientation a process is under way of developing vanguard revolutionary parties not cooperating with the communist movements. This is reflected in the articles analyzing the motive forces of the anti-imperialist revolutions and the summation of the experience of the conversion of individual countries to socialism while bypassing capitalism, and the influence of the ideas of scientific socialism on the national liberation movement. Many of the publications promote the idea of the need for a close alliance between the forces of national liberation and real socialism.

The amount of information provided by the journal increased considerably during its existence. As a rule, reports submitted directly by the parties and coming from the class battle fronts are analytical and of basic significance. This is confirmed, among others, by the permanent section "Information on New Experience." It publishes brief interviews, reports and notes describing the comprehensive creative efforts of the fraternal parties. Sections such as "Party Life," "Time. Events. Assessments," and "Reviews. Correspondence. References" provide information as well.

Creative discussions among Marxists are among the basic forms of the journal's activities. Independently or with the help of the central committees of the fraternal parties, the editors regularly sponsor international theory conferences, symposia, round-table meetings and seminars and set up international research groups. In 25 years more than 160 such collective events have taken place. Each one of them has reflected creative Marxist-Leninist thinking and the aspiration of the communists to develop revolutionary theory. The materials from such debates published in the journal indicate that they invariably take place in a spirit of free presentation and defense of viewpoints and are of a practical, principle-minded and comradely nature.

Naturally, being the joint publication of numerous parties, the journal must reflect varied experiences and the consequent, occasionally differing views and sometimes differing viewpoints on one problem or another. The consistent observance of the principles of democracy and international solidarity enables the journal to implement this task in a way which will not worsen but, conversely, eliminate differences and not weaken but strengthen creative cooperation among the communist parties.

All of the Journal's activities indicate the groundlessness of various attempts to depict it as some kind of "directive center." Anticomunist propaganda, which has not neglected the Journal ever since its appearance, persistently tries to prove, as the American journal PROBLEMS OF COMMUNISM writes, that it is "no more than a transmission mechanism for the execution of Soviet policy."

What is the real situation? What guides the Journal's activities and how are reciprocal relations between it and the individual parties and in its international collective established? How is coordination achieved in its work? Answers to these questions are found in the referential article "The Way Our Journal Works" (see No 8, 1981, p 94-96).

The Journal has always been and remains the collective publication of fraternal parties. The principles of comradely cooperation, collectivism and equality among parties have always been honored in all areas of its activities. It is these democratic principles which determine the procedure for decision-making, the nature of relations between the Journal and the fraternal parties and the norms of internal life of this international collective, consistent with its organizational structure. In its activities, formulation of political line and editorial plans the Journal is guided by the recommendations of regularly held conferences on the Journal's work by party representatives. Such meetings are becoming increasingly more representative and authoritative. For example, whereas 36 parties took part in the 1968 conference, delegations of 90 communist and worker parties and revolutionary and national liberation movements and organizations attended the November 1981 conference.

Such a considerable broadening in the range of parties and organizations involved in the Journal's work convincingly proves that it is fulfilling its mission and that its activities serve the cause of peace and social progress and express the vital needs of the communist and worker movements and the global revolutionary process. Having considered the report of the CPSU delegation, which participated in the November 1981 conference of representatives of communist and worker parties which discussed the work of PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND COMMUNISM, the CPSU Central Committee noted that "the CPSU Central Committee deems that the work of the Journal is consistent with the objectives of the struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism and contributes to the development of cooperation among communist, worker and revolutionary democratic parties."

The creative path of PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is closely related to the development of the world communist movement and the comprehensive activities of the fraternal parties which the Journal systematically reflects and with which it lives. The strengthening of such relations is the base of the achievements of the Journal over the past 25 years of its existence. Today it is published in 40 languages compared with 19 in 1958. The first years of its life the Journal was distributed in 80 countries compared with 145 today. The Journal today is read the world over. It has earned the firm recognition of the international democratic public as the international rostrum of the communists and a work which reflects the interests of the revolutionary and progressive forces in the world.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5001

CND: 1802/18

FROM OUR EXPERIENCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83) pp 83-92

[Speech by Stanislaw Wroncki, editor in chief of NOWE DROGI, theoretical and political journal of the PZPR Central Committee. Delivered at the international conference of editors in chief of theoretical and political journals of fraternal communist and worker parties, held in Prague on 10 February 1981. Reprinted from the journal NOWE DROGI, No 3, 1983]

[Text] Almost 6 years have passed since our last meeting, which was held in Warsaw and which dealt with the international significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution on the occasion of its 60th anniversary. No one among us could predict at that time the development of events in the international arena and the individual countries. Today these events have already taken place and are a thing of the past. We must assess and consider the work of our journals and the way they responded to and influenced economic, social and political processes. We must exchange experience and determine the conclusions which we could draw from this in terms of our subsequent activities.

This is the purpose of our conference at the present stage on the struggle between socialism and capitalism, between the forces of democracy, progress and socialism and peace, on the one hand, and the forces of reaction, conservatism, imperialism and war, on the other, a struggle which is the main contradiction of the contemporary world. Billions of people of all classes and nations have felt this contradiction in the past. It covers the liberation struggle for socialism and national and universal objectives aimed at a life worthy of man and, in the final account, life as such. Poland is a link in this global confrontation which affects the destinies of mankind.

Some may say that this claim has nothing new, nothing innovative and that this has been known since the October Revolution. Unfortunately, there still are those who either forget or underestimate this truth.

How did this struggle take place in Poland and what are its prospects today? How do we imagine our participation in it and our obligations? A political crisis and a struggle for power have been taking place in my country since August 1980. This struggle has already lasted 900 days. It has gone through various stages, from a refined subversive activity of concealed enemies of socialism to the open threat of starting a civil war at the end of 1981, the imposition of martial law in this connection, its lifting today and the

gradual restoration of calm and public order in accordance with the line formulated at the 9th Extraordinary Congress of the PZPR, a line which was intensified and supported on the basis of the study of practical experience.

The depth and width of the crisis are unprecedented. The danger is still not past. The origins of the crisis, naturally, are rooted in the past, although its duration, amount of economic dislocation, political breakdown, ideological chaos and moral corruption were caused by more recent reasons. The 9th Extraordinary PZPR Congress set up a special commission to determine the reasons for the outbreak of the crisis. The commission is still at work. Public debates are under way and a number of articles have been written on the crisis; the debates are in the nature of an ideological struggle.

The alien countries of socialism in the country and their foreign supporters, including Moscow, have already proclaimed the failure of socialism and the theory of "unreformability of socialism" or, in other words, the theory of the imminent evil. It may have seemed that such criticism could be no threat to us, for it conflicts with the clear economic and cultural accomplishments of socialism in our country and the improved material and social situation of millions of even the poorest citizens, visible to the naked eye. This is well known to the senior generations. To them this is the most convincing and accurate argument in favor of socialism. However, this argument is not so obvious to the generations unfamiliar with living conditions under capitalism, born after the war. They perceive capitalism through shop windows or motion pictures seen during trips abroad. The errors and omissions in the educational system, which took place over decades, developed a nihilistic attitude on the part of the youth toward the achievements of the past and a consumerist demand far in excess of the country's real possibilities. A "model" of socialism which gives everything to everybody, easily adopted by some of our young people unaccustomed to a feeling of duty, could not fail to result in fatal consequences.

Disparities between socialist ideals and real negative phenomena in practical life, noted by the young, are also destructive from the moral viewpoint. Such phenomena, unless opposed, officially condemned and their culprits specifically named, regardless of their positions, are blamed by the inexperienced youth on the social system. They discredit the state system and socialism and turn it into a factor which worsens the crisis. It is largely for this reason that the young people proved to be receptive to the theory of the "unreformability of socialism" and it is essentially they who fell under the influence of the demagoguery practiced by the Solidarity leadership.

The primitive anti-bucliet steps aimed at the most ignorant people and uncontrolled emotions included attempts to blame the crisis on economic relations with the USSR. Yet, matters are entirely different. It is precisely economic dependence on the West and the light-handedness with which the country floundered owing the tremendous amount of \$27 billion as a result of so-called "excessively reasonable licenses," which had lost their progressive role in the production process and were granted with relaxed traps, as a result of which the end product could be manufactured only with the condition of importing so-called "petty items," that proved to be a fatal pump draining

and economy and the base for uninterrupted political blackmail and attempts to restrict the country's sovereignty. A variety of grounds exists today for the effect that this was no accident and not merely the result of an erroneous formulation on the part of the party and government which ruled the country at that time but the deliberate strategy of some Western countries, the United States above all.

Ever since people's Poland was established, the Soviet Union has supported its economic development on the basis of fraternal and mutually profitable cooperation and trade and, during difficult and critical periods, on the basis of economic aid. The last 2 years are a confirmation of this fact, particularly the last year, when the United States, in violation of the international norms, resorted to economic "sanctions" and mounted a gross propaganda aggression, interfering in Polish domestic affairs, using the events in Poland as an opportunity for aggravating international relations, and undermining the Yalta agreements with a view to changing the ratio of forces in the international arena in its favor. This was also a kind of revenge for the failure of the imperialist plans aimed at overthrowing the socialist system in Poland and dividing the defensive Warsaw Pact.

Views are frequently expressed in interpreting the reasons for the Polish crisis limited to subjective factors, such as errors committed by the party's and government's leadership, and the insufficient development of socialist democracy. The study of the class structure of society and the stage of development of socialism in Poland are ignored; the influence of internal and external socialist forces and their desire for global confrontation with the capitalist world are ignored as well.

Equationably, formalism and the emasculation of the essence of socialist democracy and scorn for the principles of democratic and joint rule in party life played a negative role. However, the excessively exaggerated assessment of this matter pours grist in the mill of those who invest the vague slogan of "democracy" with an antisocial meaning. The further development of the principles of democracy, which are inseparable from our political system, is necessary. However, this applies to a socialist democracy with a clear class orientation.

According to some the essential reason for the crisis is the violation of the national specifics, the alleged adoption by Poland of the "Soviet model" of socialism. These views are clearly contrary to the facts. Neither the structure of Polish agriculture nor relations between church and state have anything in common with the "Soviet model" of socialism. Also substantially different is the structure of the governmental system, industrial management, lifestyle, development of culture, youth education, and so on, and so forth. If it is possible to speak of a "Soviet model" of socialism at all, it should mean precisely a Soviet variety. However, there cannot even be a question of any neglect and underestimating of Polish national specifics as the reason for the crisis in Poland. We know, for example, that despite the specific nature of Polish agriculture, we were unable to organize satisfactorily food supplies to the population. The reasons for this lie not only in the slower development of the agricultural structure but the insufficiency of capital investments in it. Both problems require further solutions.

Many studies have already been made of the reasons for breakdowns and crises in building socialism in our country. Parts of them have been published in *SWP* [DWA]. However, this topic is by far not exhausted. The study of the sources and reasons for the crisis is continuing. It is being intensified and corrected. The cooling off of tempers and the gradual process of rebirth and consolidation of the party are leading to the elaboration of more objective assessments. Views on the class struggle and on organizational and moral criteria of party-mindedness, the weakening of which in the past led to fatal consequences, are undergoing radical changes.

Still, this is not the only reason for the difficulties. Let us consider our material and spiritual socialist institutions. We can easily note that by far not all decisions made by specific officials in these establishments are contributing to the strengthening of socialism. Not everything being created under the screen of socialism in the socialist sector is truly socialist and consistent with the ideals and nature of socialism. Unfortunately, our practice frequently conflicts with our ideals, something which the people notice and feel. That is the real source of the trouble. The People's Republic of Poland is a socialist state. However, the building of socialism in it has not been entirely completed.

That is why it seems to me that during the transitional period the problems of the struggle, work and upbringing remain, although amended, most topical and basic. The theses formulated several years ago at the 7th and 8th party congresses to the effect that we have already advanced to the stage of building a developed socialist society and that the "moral and political unity" of the people to this effect exists proved to be wrong, premature and harmful. Their promotion was accompanied by a propagandist glossing-over of reality, universally practiced at that time, which undermined the faith not only in propaganda but in the party. The economic laws governing the building of socialism and the socialist principles of social justice, socialist democracy and the Leninist norms of party development and activities were violated.

I am deeply convinced that no one is protected from errors and that there is no system or mechanism which would prevent such errors in the tremendous project of building socialism, which involves millions of people. However, the Polish experience cautions us about the dangerous consequences of errors which have not been corrected on time, most firmly and unhesitatingly, not through meaningless statements and trivia but through real criticism and self-criticism.

The period of building the foundations of socialism in our country was marked by a significant growth of production forces. During the last decade this development was marked by high pace and scope. Unfortunately, it was not harmonious. Violations of the principle of proportional development of all industrial sectors resulted in tremendous losses and waste of funds. Thus, discoordination between the development of the power industry and the level of development of industry led to losses which reached as high as 20 percent of production capacities and idling in the work of labor collectives in which appeals for discipline were a mockery of common sense, triggered violations of cooperation relations and other tremendous losses. The excessive expanded

area of capital construction as well led to tremendous outlays which failed to yield expected results. This was not the fault of the working class. The responsibility falls on those who made such decisions.

At the beginning of the '70s we relied on the so-called "new strategy," which gave preference to consumption as the motive force of economic development. Instead of basing this strategy on a well-planned and socially coordinated wage system, strictly based on labor results, we engaged in the so-called wage control which violated the principle of the faster development of labor productivity compared to wages and an equal increase in the production of consumer goods. The distributed national income exceeded income from production. This gap was compensated with the help of consumer credits. Living on credit was the consequence of such a false economic strategy. Consumption was not based on a firm foundation. Machinations, easy earnings and abuses of official position for personal purposes became increasingly widespread, inflicting from the top and ever more deeply to the bottom some of the apparatus and intensifying demoralization and corruption. This led to major violations of the principles of ordinary common social justice.

The labor management and organization system was inconsistent with the requirements of the efficient utilization of production capacities and with strengthening the feeling of social ownership. It was burdened by excessive bureaucratism, directives and bans without economic regulators or various incentives for upgrading labor productivity and ensuring the better organization of labor, initiative and thrift.

In agrarian policy the course of specialization of individual farms was based on the support of the peasant-producer, who was getting richer and was subsidized with substantial loans half of which were subsequently forgiven. This peasant stratum, which accounted for the minority of the rural population, was unable to resolve the problem of securing the population with food products and became the political support of the system, despite the benefits it enjoyed. It was precisely in this stratum that the enemy recruited the *aktyv* for the opposition organization of the so-called Rural Solidarity. No more than 4 percent of the industrial production capacities were in agriculture. This caused the underestimating of the food program which, at a certain point, became international and political.

The unwillingness to listen to criticism from below, the suppression and even persecution of the critics and the violation of the principles of socialist democracy, as stipulated in the Constitution, were exceptionally important reasons for the failure to avoid the crisis which broke out.

On the eve of the 8th Party Congress, in the course of the pre-congress discussions, the *aktyv* expressed its concern at the increased negative phenomena and processes. However, the criticism of the meaningless yet noisily advertised slogan of building a "second Poland," done for purposes of show only, and the suggestions formulated by the *aktyv* were ignored. This caused mistrust and doubting in party ranks, weakened the party and lowered the power of party influence. A broad opportunity developed for action on the part of the antisocialist forces which were becoming organized and energized and

which had long awaited a suitable occasion for mounting an attack on the party and on the foundations of the socialist system in Poland

The counterrevolutionary groups openly joined the wave of labor protest and indignation which appeared for these reasons in August 1980. The wasted opportunity for implementing the expected and necessary changes, both after the 8th PZPR Congress and in the course of the mounting crisis, faced the party with the need to make such changes already under the pressure of the masses, frequently provoked by hostile forces. This made far-reaching compromises, fraught with serious dangers for the future, necessary.

There is a long list of problems which require a profound study and critical interpretation in the light of Marxist-Leninist science. We do this through *WPR* *ISSN* and try to initiate their principle-minded and creative development.

Today, bearing in mind the need to surmount the chaos and ideological errors, in the course of building socialism and shaping the social consciousness, we return to the prime sources of Marxism-Leninism. Bearing in mind the omissions and our new tasks, we call for the popularization of the foundations of our social science and ideology. In correcting erroneous methods used in their implementation, we are not revising the principles of socialism but, in accordance with them, correct social practice and try to restore the attractiveness of the socialist ideals.

The political essence of the developed circumstances lies in strengthening the leading role of the party in society and in the state. The leading positions of the party and the state were seriously weakened during the crisis. Now, however, they are gradually becoming stronger. One of the necessary prerequisites for this process is purging administrative and economic cadres from incapable bureaucratized people, establishing strict responsibility for the implementation of obligations everywhere and protecting people from slanderous attacks mounted for counterrevolutionary purposes.

It will take the party many long years to gain the role of political vanguard trusted by the overwhelming share of the working class and the entire society. At the start of the previous decade, the party leadership and, with it, the entire party, enjoyed a growing prestige and support among the working class and the overwhelming majority of the people encouraged, at that time, by hopes for the rapid development of the country and the tangible growth of individual consumption. However, the people were not informed of the fact that this was largely the result of the debts incurred by the state and that, as time went by, the failure of this policy was inevitable. This is precisely what happened and, with it, faith in the party's leadership was lost. The delayed purge of party ranks from corrupt and unprincipled careerists, failure to mount a prompt struggle against evil and the slowness in correcting errors resulted in the fact that the slogan of "socialist renovation" was not accompanied by specific, decisive and clear actions. Hesitations, a position of expectation, and following the tail end of events under the pressure of the elements allowed the enemy to seize the initiative and made it necessary to take to task the party and state cadres, in the course of which honest but

unsuitable people frequently became compromised. The party began to lose its moral authority.

Let us recall Lenin's words that the party is "the mind, honor and conscience of our epoch." Two out of the three words are of the highest moral significance. The crisis in the PZPR at that time covered all three features indicated by Lenin. Such a party could not successfully implement its leading and guiding role in society.

The predecessors of the PZPR—the revolutionary parties of the Polish proletariat—were the parties of the most oppressed and poorest people; their members were ready to sacrifice themselves for the sake of the liberation of the working class and the peasantry, for serving the people. They were distinguished by their moral purity. At the start of the postwar period of the country's restoration, these values were dominant in the party. Gradually, however, they began to be eroded by careerists and, finally, of late, were subjected to heavy corrosion. Suspicious concepts, ideologically and morally opportunist, became widespread. The most difficult problem now is for the party to regain its lost moral position. The solution of this problem was initiated by purging the party ranks of compromised members. Thousands of intelligent and experienced working people, who enjoy the recognition and trust of the labor collectives, must be drawn into the party apparatus. Service to the working class and the entire people must be paralleled by the skillful exposure of the efforts of the enemies of socialism with their low morality about which we are learning more and more from discovered documents. The masks of the false friends of the people must be torn from their faces. This is a minimum requirement. In order for the party to become what it was in the past it cannot be the same as it was yesterday, W. Jaruzelski, PZPR Central Committee first secretary, said. The party must change.

Speaking of the forthcoming changes aimed at restoring the party's leading role in society, the hundreds of thousands of workers who remained within the party and the young people who are either party members or will join the party not for individual advantages but for serving an idea under more difficult conditions, requiring civic courage and firmness, are a source of optimism. Another source of optimism is the existence of an aktiv which turned neither to the right nor to the left, which did not abandon the party foundation and common sense, which defended its positions and which is today gradually turning to the offensive. In order to strengthen and disseminate this situation the party must engage in more efficient work. The educational role of the state and the entire ideological front must increase. This pertains to the following basic problem: does the present generation adopt the ideals of socialism as its own? Will it turn its indignation against the violations of the principles of social justice and will it direct its enthusiasm and forces to the creation of material and cultural values and to promoting the well-being of the homeland and its own?

Our task is to pass on to the young generation convincingly and ably the revolutionary traditions, the legacy of theoretical thinking and our aspiration consistently to build socialism. We have done a great deal for Marxism-Leninism to gain scientific prestige and social recognition in

Poland. We realize, however, that omissions in this area and the shock of the crisis weakened the positions of our ideology. This harm must be corrected, the more so since non-Marxist views as well are being disseminated in our country. Marxism-Leninism must strengthen in Poland the scientific and social force of its arguments proving superiority of content and methods and their creative nature, and the practical implementation of its program. This is the purpose of the entire party system, the resolutions of the Central Committee plenums, the gradual energizing and restructuring of ideological work and the enhancement of party requirements.

The attitude toward religion and believers has always played an important role in socialist theory and practice and in Marxism-Leninism. This problem becomes particularly important today. Despite excessively optimistic assessments, the process of reorganization of social awareness, that of gaining freedom from church influence in particular, is not developing rapidly. Religion and its churches have existed for millennia and will exist for a long time to come. The Marxists do not support a political struggle against religion and the believers.

In defending its materialistic outlook, the communist movement must mandatorily pursue a realistic policy toward religious institutions and organizations. We must look for conditions which will make possible the coexistence of the Catholic Church and the socialist state on a constitutional basis. The recent events in Poland proved the importance of constructive and responsible positions shown by the large numbers of believers and a certain segment of the clergy and the activeness of the militant-reactionary clergy which has clearly not reconciled itself to the realities of socialism. In this area our policy is consistent and flexible. Clerical anticommunism must be met with a firm rebuff.

We also face the task of restricting and eliminating from social life petit bourgeois customs and morality. The socialist way of life, conceived not only in terms of material well-being but of sociocultural opportunities and realities also, must constitute a clear program for private and social life. This is a particularly complex matter in the circumstances of the tremendous difficulties related to the crisis.

The rebirth and strengthening of the PZPR, on the one hand, and the broadening of the system of its alliances and acquiring the broadest possible circle of social partners, on the other, are prerequisites for success in our work. The party is seeking solutions based on the specific situation prevailing in Poland. They include the historically developed tripartite system of interaction among the PZPR, as the leading force, the United Peasant Party and the intermediary strata and some of the intelligentsia within the Democratic Party, with the participation of late Christian associations which accept the constitution of the socialist state. The beginning has been laid to the patriotic movement for national rebirth, which will become a form of true cooperation between the PZPR and allied parties, on the one hand, and all constructive forces within the society, on the other, and an important link in socialist democracy. We are convinced that despite the tremendous difficulties the party will be able to lead Poland out of the crisis. It

assumes full--patriotic and international--responsibility for the solution of the problem.

Let us consider the most important aspects of the activities of *NOWE DROGI* within the period under consideration and the problems to the solution of which we have dedicated our efforts. The political line taken by the editors in this difficult period was positively rated last January at a session of the editorial council, consisting of members of the party's central leadership. This assessment does not give us grounds for complacency or self-satisfaction. Although in a number of areas we were able to achieve significant results, we were unable to avoid omissions and topic gaps. We did not implement some concepts because of old and new weaknesses in the party's scientific-theoretical base on which *NOWE DROGI* largely relies in its activities. During this entire recent period we have felt the enemy attacks and the gravity of the struggle. This struggle was concentrated in five most important areas.

First, the area of historical research and education, in which the right-wing forces within the society tried and are trying to misrepresent the past by denying the role of the labor movement and its struggle for social liberation, to rehabilitate the policy of the rich classes and their Pilsudski-type representatives, refuted by reality itself, and to restore the reactionary myths, hostilities and illusions and various types of nationalism, including the messianic and cosmopolitan concepts of Poland's "special mission" in Europe, in Eastern Europe in particular. They start from the distant past, when Poland had been assigned the role of bulwark of Christianity in eastern Europe.

We posed and resolved these problems in articles which analyzed from class positions the stages of contemporary Polish history and refuted views hostile and alien to us on most important historical problems. A debate sponsored by the editors considered phenomena dangerous in terms of molding the historical consciousness of the people and aimed at shaping such consciousness under current conditions. A long cycle of articles was published on the occasion of the centennial of the Polish labor movement. Documentary materials were published on the history of the struggle waged by the Polish working class and its revolutionary movement, which are of particular value as documentary proof of historical truth but largely unfamiliar to the aktiv. We initiated a cycle of articles on noted past leaders of our party.

The second area is related to assessments of the 38-year-old period of existence of People's Socialist Poland. The purpose of the enemy was to cast aspersions on this entire period and each of its individual stages and to disseminate extremely pessimistic and openly nihilistic views on the entire history of people's Poland. We countered such misrepresentations with an objective assessment of the socialist 38-year-old period by proving past achievements without concealing deformations, errors and weaknesses caused by both subjective and objective factors. This applied to the unquestionable achievements which, all in all, dominated the accomplishments of the entire existence of the People's Republic of Poland and its individual stages, and which will become decisive factors in the process of returning the country to the path of sensible and balanced development.

In promoting a socialist renovation, conceived not as a revision of the inviolable principles of the socialist system but as a set of necessary changes and corrections which eliminate deformations and enrich socialist practice, we actively countered efforts to invent in vague "renovation" slogans a content which leads to the weakening and destruction of the governmental system and the appearance of elements which clash with the principles of socialism and the interests of the toiling masses.

In the recent period the third area of our work was the interpretation from a Marxist-Leninist viewpoint the current and planned changes. This includes important problems related to the building of socialism and the nature and forms of democracy, inseparable from it, the real aspect of classes and strata and their interrelationship, formulas and practices of national consensus, understood in a Leninist way as the alliance between the party and the other prosocialist forces and between the working class and the other toiling classes and population strata, in which the worker-peasant alliance plays a special role. This also includes problems related to the implementation of the principles of social justice and the assessment of already accomplished and planned social changes.

A very important trend in this area is the interpretation of the problems of economic reform within the framework of a socialist planned economy, in accordance with the laws and patterns of the socialist system in the areas of ownership, planning and management, and proving the groundlessness of the concept of so-called "market socialism." In the tragic situations imposed by the enemy, we comprehensively argued that it was better to sweat than to shed blood.

The fourth area of our struggle was defending the principles of Poland's foreign policy, our alliances, our affiliation with the socialist commonwealth and the principles of internationalism. The enemy attacked the Polish-Soviet alliance particularly fiercely. A dirty wave of anti-Sovietism rose. NOWE DROGI published numerous articles exposing the anti-people's nature of anti-Sovietism and anticommunism. Statements by leading political personalities and noted members of the intelligentsia were published on the international importance of the USSR on the occasion of its 60th anniversary. Materials from the journals of the fraternal parties began to be reprinted more frequently and a detailed presentation of their content became a permanent journal section. We are planning an increase in the number of articles written for us by authors from the fraternal parties.

We ascribe particular importance to coverage of the current stage in the struggle for disarmament and a return to the policy of detente and cooperation in international relations and the exposure of imperialist forces which aggravate the situation and, particularly, that of cold war policy pursued by the Reagan administration.

The fifth area of our activities is the defense and development of the principles of the leading role of the party and the study and summation of related experience and the struggle against enemy attempts to belittle the role of the PZPR, and against the opportunistic concepts which have been most

clearly manifested in disintegration initiatives of so-called "horizontal structures." We are struggling against any distortion of the party's role and, on the basis of practical experience, including that of the party organizations at large enterprises, try to disseminate the Leninist norms of democratic centralism.

By considering them as a single entity, we counter both trends toward weakening the party's ideological and organizational unity and its transformation into a kind of "debate club," as well as the creation of an appearance of intraparty democracy and smoothing over the gravity of the real situation.

In many articles we also expose the danger of the right-wing deviation which, along with the one to the left, threatens the party. These deviations are essentially part of the phenomena and processes occurring today in Poland. As we pointed out, the struggle for the restoration and strengthening of the positions of Marxism-Leninism in the party's ideological life and shaping the outlook of the party membership is related to these problems.

The preparation and publication of extensive selections from V. I. Lenin's works on the party of a new type and the class nature of the state and democracy were also of great importance. These selections were subsequently published in large editions and made available to the broad aktiv. They enriched the discussion within the party and contributed to the fact that in the very emotional debates on the sources of the crisis and the means to surmount it Leninist formulations were heard and references to the experience of the CPSU and the international labor movement were made.

Naturally, these five main groups of problems do not account for the entire content of the journal and its tasks. We encourage individual authors or groups of authors to suggest topics and means for their development and to initiate debates. We have currently initiated the holding of a session on the legacy of Karl Marx, above all in terms of Poland, closely related to internationalism. We also intend to hold discussions on two problems of key importance to us: the close ties between socialism and democracy and the historical experience of the international policy pursued by Poland and its allies.

Another important suggestion is that of publishing a cycle of monographs on the experience of the party organizations and labor collectives in large enterprises throughout the entire period, starting with August 1980. This experience, which enabled us to test through practical experience the various concepts and slogans raised by various forces during that period, offers the irrefutable proof in favor of our party, socialism, the internationalist principles in Polish governmental policy, on the one hand, and exposes the counterrevolutionary intentions of the enemy, on the other.

Let me particularly emphasize the project started by our editors of publishing the complete minutes of the PZPR Central Committee sessions. This meets the wishes of the aktiv and means the implementation of the properly understood principle of publicity in PZP activities. The minutes indicate the entire complexity of the situation, the various trends within which the

party's policy becomes crystallized, and the gravity of the struggle for giving it a creative Marxist-Leninist nature.

We realize the importance of the tasks facing us and understand that by far not all possibilities for involving authors and upgrading the quality of their materials have been utilized. Unquestionably, the party's resolutions on such problems will constitute a step forward in the implementation of the line formulated at the 9th PZPR Congress in the field of the ideological and political struggle, closely related to surmounting the crisis, engaging in socialist reforms and broadening the cooperation among patriotic forces.

We are trying to develop and enrich cooperation with all fraternal editorial boards in the socialist countries and the political and theoretical organs of the other communist parties. The other countries may draw conclusions useful to all of us from our experience and from their own past and current experiences. For this reason, we try to exchange thoughts and views and to discuss problems and surmount occasionally superficial evaluations. We consider as our common duty the important task of theoretically developing and summing up the experience of the past and the extraction from it of conclusions for the future.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/18

IMPORTANT FACTOR OF PEACE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83)
pp 93-101

[Article by V. Sobakin and V. Shaposhnikov]

[Text] Mankind's entry in the nuclear age not only drastically changed the international situation by ascribing to it a number of essentially new features but has had an increasing impact on various areas of human life, such as economics, politics, outlook, culture and even ecology. The problem of nuclear weapons is not new. It has existed for about 40 years. However, it is precisely of late that a clear understanding has developed of the real scale and gravity of a qualitatively new factor: the threat of destruction of all life on earth in the flames of a nuclear catastrophe.

The awareness of the danger of nuclear weapons on the part of increasing masses of people gave life to the worldwide peace movement. Over a long period of time it developed its system of principles, slogans and practical requirements for the implementation of which increasingly new population strata and groups are joining the struggle. The antiwar movement reached particular scope by the turn of the 1980s, when the threat of nuclear war began to be conceived as a reality which no one interested in simple survival can ignore.

Today the powerful peace movement, which is developing in width and in depth, has become a power which is largely influencing the policies of all countries and governments. "The mass antiwar movements," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov pointed out, "are an important factor in favor of peace. The state leaders and governments which care for the opinions of their nations cannot ignore it. In this sense, unquestionably, the peace movement is influencing the arms limitation talks."

The socialist countries show great understanding for the demands of the antiwar movement. As was noted in the joint declaration which was adopted on 28 June 1983 at the Moscow meeting of heads of party and state leaders of the socialist countries, the basic interests and aspirations of peoples of Europe and the world over are clearly manifested in the numerous mass antiwar demonstrations which call for guaranteeing the right of peoples and nations to a free, dignified and peaceful existence, and the addresses of parliaments, scientists, physicians and representatives of social circles at different international forums, such as the "For Peace and Life and Against Nuclear War" world assembly, which took place in Prague on 21-26 June last.

Unprecedented social, political and ideological scope and variety are major characteristic features of the contemporary antiwar movement. This is a broad movement of youth organizations, ecologists, church groups, pacifists, feminists, trade union organizations, opponents of militarism, concerned soldiers, physicians and people practicing other professions, mothers of small infants and politicians.

New population groups become involved and new organizations and alliances are established on an antinuclear platform. International realities have led to a situation in which one group or another among the ruling class in the capitalist countries and even individual representatives of monopoly capital, in a display of political sobriety, are sharing some of the objectives of such movements (above all in terms of eliminating the threat of a worldwide thermonuclear war and the need for peaceful coexistence as the only conceivable alternative to such a war). As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov noted at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, those politicians in the capitalist world who realistically take the international situation into consideration, "realize that irreversible processes have already taken place in the world. They realize the need for and reciprocal advantage of a lengthy peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems. For our part, we have frequently said and repeat that we are ready for this. We are convinced that this is consistent with the interests of the peoples on both sides of the social barricade which divides the world."

Inherent in the antiwar movement as a whole are an extensive variety of organizations, groups and movements with their own specifics in terms of methods, means and trends of activity, most frequently autonomous or even totally independent of any national or international center. It is entirely understandable that the members of the various social strata and groups and different political parties and trends within the movement bring into it, in addition to antiwar feelings, all the various ideological-political views which objectively exist within bourgeois society and which sometimes are essentially incompatible.

The antiwar movement is based on the mass organizations of working people. The importance of this fact is enhanced by their rich experience in the struggle against war and militarism. At the same time, a characteristic feature in recent years has been the increasingly active participation of noted scientists from many countries in this movement--specialists in a great variety of areas of knowledge, members of the largest scientific centers, physicians, men of culture and the arts, parliamentary experts and consultants, and personnel of intergovernmental organizations.

Against the background of the upsurge of mass antiwar actions, particularly noticeable are the activities of women's organizations, which are part of a great variety of coalitions of peace-loving forces and, in a number of cases, are the initiators of extensive international actions and campaigns. A characteristic feature of the organizers of the "Peace March--'81" and "Peace March--'82" was that most of their participants were women.

Over the past 1.5 to 2 years a variety of movements for the prevention of nuclear war have appeared among scientists. Thus, the international movement "Physicians of the World for the Prevention of Nuclear War," which developed on the basis of meetings between Soviet and American physicians, has become an influential force today. In the resolution adopted in April 1982 by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences American scientists spoke out in support of the SALT II treaty and other agreements on restricting the arms race and stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons. They emphasized the groundlessness of views on the admissibility of "limited" nuclear warfare.

The participation of influential forces such as social democratic movements and churches and, something quite unusual, military, including people who were until recently high-ranking NATO personnel, is a major distinguishing feature of the current stage in the antiwar movement.

All the characteristic features of the contemporary antiwar movement were manifested in their entirety in the course of the preparations for and holding of the "For Peace and Life and Against Nuclear War" world assembly.

Let us note here above all the way the participants in the assembly themselves described the current peace movement. "The power of this widespread and varied peace movement lies in its ability to act as a cohesive force," the unanimously passed assembly appeal stipulates. "We are deeply convinced that whatever differences may exist on one problem or another among us, nothing should divide us in the face of our common objective--to safeguard peace and life and to prevent a nuclear war."

These words are the key to understanding not only the reasons for the success of the assembly which is unparalleled in the peace-loving public in recent years in terms of the variety of its participants, but also the dynamics of the development of the antiwar movement at large.

The dividing line between two decades--the 1970s and the 1980s--also becomes the dividing line between the period of detente and that of drastic aggravation of international tension, increased arms race and enhanced nuclear threat. The various forces in the world have different explanations for the reasons and origins of this turn of events. The imperialist militaristic circles are trying to justify their line of confrontation and growth of armaments by referring to the "Soviet military threat." The concept of "rivalry between the two superpowers," which is an effort to explain the entire complex process of the increased military threat, gained some popularity. However, neither are consistent with reality. They merely distort the understanding of the profound origins of the existing situation, which may be found in the aggressive, violent and reactionary nature of imperialism, openly expressed in the policies of the current American administration.

Regardless of existing differences in understanding the reasons for the intensified danger of nuclear warfare, the tremendous majority of people on earth unanimously believe that this threat has increased excessively. The participants in the Prague Assembly opened their appeal to the world public with the following words filled with profound concern: "Mankind has reached

a crucial crossroads in its history. A single step taken in the wrong direction may push the world into the precipice of nuclear war.

However, a mere notice of the threat of war is not enough. The question the people ask is the following: Is there any salvation from the unrestrained arms race, and could this dangerous sliding toward the nuclear chasm be stopped? The Prague Assembly gave a clear answer to this by stating that war is not fatally inevitable, that it is still not too late to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. "Salvation is in the hands of the nations themselves, of every man and woman firmly acting in favor of peace.

The appeal of the assembly calls for focusing the efforts on meeting the urgent demands of all nations on earth. The first among them is to prevent the deployment of new first-strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe, to reduce all nuclear armaments on the European continent and to work for the total elimination of nuclear weapons the world over.

The appeal calls for an immediate freeze of all nuclear arsenals and an end to the arms race--both nuclear and conventional--the creation of nuclear-free zones and universal and total disarmament. It insists on the need for peaceful political talks and the rejection of military confrontation. It cautions against the danger of instilling in the people the thought of the "missibility" of the use of nuclear weapons and the possibility of waging a "limited" or "protracted" nuclear war and proclaims that "preparations for a nuclear war are the greatest crime against mankind."

The appeal of the world assembly is a cluster of all ideas, evaluations and suggestions expressed at that forum. We must bear in mind that the significance of these suggestions and demands, which the Soviet peace fighters consider self-evident, lies precisely in the fact that they were adopted by representatives of organizations and movements which support entirely different political orientations and ideological concepts.

It can be said that the participants in the Prague Assembly were able to draft a broad program for the contemporary international antiwar movement. The overall views it expresses are a very important result of this assembly which will have a positive impact on the further development of the movement well into the future.

The political spectrum of the participants in the assembly was inordinately broad. According to the final data, 3,625 people representing 132 countries and 119 international organizations offered the following picture of their political affiliations: 68 communist and worker parties; 49 national democratic parties and liberation movements; 40 socialist, social democratic and centrist parties; and 11 Christian democratic and conservative parties.

It is noteworthy that representatives of the public in the socialist countries accounted for 20 percent of the overall number of participants; members of the developing countries accounted for about 40 percent and representatives of capitalist countries, for more than 40. Such statistical data lead to a conclusion of major political importance: the representatives of the

socialist countries or people with communist convictions were only part, a minority, of the entire group of participants!

Also noteworthy is the study of the various categories of society as represented at the assembly. They included 127 national trade union organizations, 93 organizations of women, 189 of young people and 61 of religious affiliations.

The following is a legitimate question: what made it possible for them to gather together, to engage in a constructive dialogue and to adopt common positions? The reasons for this are several. Above all, they include some political characteristics of today's international situation and the awareness of the broad toiling masses of the fact that the United States is trying to turn Western Europe into a possible theater of military operations involving the use of nuclear weapons.

At the same time, the foreign policy course pursued by the Soviet Union and its specific initiatives aimed at radically improving the situation in Europe and in the entire international arena gave the peace-loving forces the opportunity to resolve the developing situation. Under these circumstances, awareness of the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear war had not a paralyzing but, conversely, a catalytic influence on social activeness.

The deepening economic crisis in the capitalist world has also exerted its influence. The worsened socioeconomic situation of the masses is intensified by the drastic increase in military budgets and armament expenditures. The broad masses are realizing through personal experience that the militarization of the economy has only aggravated the unemployment problem and that the further increase in armaments and military budgets is taking place at the expense of reducing outlays for social needs. That is why today socioeconomic demands are formulated as a rule alongside antiwar slogans. This is becoming particularly typical of the United States in which social objections to the new military budget of the American administration is increasing. It is precisely this which also explains the noted shift in the position held by the trade unions in the capitalist countries, which are favoring a more active participation in the peace movement and are calling for an end to the arms race.

The moral-ethical and religious reasons which bring into the peace movement believers of different faiths and even some circles in the Catholic, evangelical, Buddhist and other church hierarchies are of major significance.

The "ecological" motivation for participation in the antiwar movement on the part of groups which realize that the humane objective of preserving the environment they pursue demands, above all, an end to the arms race, a reduction in military expenditures and, in the final account, the prevention of nuclear war, is relatively new. They realize that the solution of the problems they are interested in is possible only through the cooperation and unification of the efforts of all countries, hindered by the confrontation policy pursued by the Reagan administration.

The broad and varied composition of the participants in the assembly reflected the breakdown of forces in the contemporary antiwar movement and the variety of motivations of its social strata, groups, political parties and social organizations, their slogans and demands and the various emphases of requirements all of them share. The same can be said of the various directions within the peace movement and its numerous social and professional groups under the very specific conditions prevailing in their countries.

Such characteristics and disparities and occasional rivalries among antiwar organizations of different political and social orientations existed in the past as well. In recent years, however, as we already mentioned, the range of differences among them has increased even further, something on which the opponents of the antiwar movement speculate in an effort to divide it and to promote clashes among the antiwar forces operating under dissimilar political and geographic conditions. These efforts were firmly rebuffed by the entire proceedings of the assembly and its results.

Naturally, it is not a question of an effort to suppress an unsuitable opinion or, even less so, to silence someone from expressing it for the sake of formal and superficial unity. Under the present circumstances the unity among the different antiwar forces is achieved on the basis of their conscious aspiration not to aggravate objective differences existing among them but to set them aside, to give them second priority, while jointly seeking points of contact which would help them to resolve the common problem of preventing a nuclear war.

In turn, this requires not simply an exchange of different opinions but a real dialogue in the course of which its participants try to reach clear conclusions and assessments acceptable to all and accords on joint or parallel actions.

The Prague World Assembly became precisely such a meaningful and effective dialogue which yielded positive results. Actually, the dialogue began not during the assembly itself but much earlier. Twenty-two international preparatory meetings were held during the first half of 1983 in several countries, with the participation of more than 500 representatives of different organizations and movements. Topics such as the danger of nuclear war (Geneva), European safety (Brussels), termination of the arms race (Geneva), exchange of experience among peace movements (Athens), the role of the United Nations in matters of peace and disarmament (Geneva), economic aspects of the arms race and disarmament (Stockholm), development and international cooperation (Budapest), social, psychological and ethical aspects of the arms race, war and disarmament (New York), the role of the nonaligned movement (Cairo), problems of the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Latin America (Prague) and education in a spirit of peace and prevention of war (Paris) were held.

In addition to such topic meetings, preparatory sessions were held by the various interest and professional groups. Meetings were held by workers in education (Paris), religious leaders (Geneva), lawyers and jurists (Geneva), women (Geneva), members of parliament (Helsinki), scientists (Vienna), art workers (Sofia), physicians (Prague), journalists (Prague), trade union leaders (Vienna), and young people and university students (Prague).

The mere enumeration of the topics which were subsequently discussed at the assembly itself proves the range of interests of the contemporary peace movement and the great understanding shown by its participants of the fact that the prevention of war cannot be accomplished simply with general appeals for peace and that the implementation of this task requires a profound knowledge of the numerous problems and the formulation of coordinated suggestions for their settlement.

Also indicative is the geography of the preparatory meetings. Their work was made possible by the peace movements of 12 countries on three continents. This is one more confirmation of the increased possibilities of the antiwar movement and the aspiration for international cooperation within its ranks.

Naturally, it is self-evident that the main responsibility for the organizational and financial support of the world assembly was assumed by the Czechoslovak preparatory committee which, as unanimously acknowledged by all participants, brilliantly coped with this difficult task. Literally all the Czechoslovak people became involved in the preparations for an holding of the assembly. On the day of its opening, more than 200,000 people attended a meeting at Staroměstská Square. The full cost of the Czechoslovak preparatory committee for the organization of the world assembly was covered by the Peace and Solidarity Fund which consisted exclusively of voluntary donations by Czechoslovak citizens. The overall contribution exceeded 60 million kronas. This is one more eloquent answer to all ill-wishers who are trying to "prove" that the antiwar movements in the socialist countries are "financed by the state," for which reason they are allegedly not independent.

On the eve of the assembly, its ill-wishers frightened those who intended to go to Prague, particularly members of organizations which had appeared relatively recently and had never before participated in such international gatherings, with statements to the effect that everything at the assembly would be "so organized" that opinions different from the "stipulations of the Communist World Peace Council" will be impossible to express. The entire preparatory work and the holding of the assembly itself clearly refuted such insinuations. Even participants who had come to the assembly with a certain feeling of caution were able to see that the assembly became a place of true dialogue in which everyone freely expressed his viewpoint.

Discussions and debates even exceeded the organizational framework of the 11 groups for political dialogue, meetings based on interests, the "women's center" and the "youth countryside," which worked in accordance with the program of the assembly and at which some 2,000 delegates took the floor. Throughout the proceedings, from morning to late evening, not only in the big and small assembly rooms but in the numerous halls, foyers and coffee shops in the huge Prague Palace of Culture various groups met and engaged in lively discussions unbound by any regulations whatsoever.

The result of these exchanges of views, arguments and discussions were the reports submitted on all dialogues and meetings. These most interesting documents prove the professional competence and moral-political responsibility of their collective authors--the representatives of the peace-loving

public of different countries--who were able to formulate a type of catalogue of requirements, the implementation of which, in the general view, is necessary for the preservation of peace and life and the prevention of nuclear war.

The study of U.S. and NATO nuclear documents led the participants in the dialogues to the conclusion that their purpose is to attain military superiority and to establish a base for a victory in a nuclear war. They condemned these doctrines. They supported the idea that NATO and the Warsaw Pact members should sign a treaty on the nonuse of military force. The attention of the U.S., British and French governments was drawn to the demand to assume the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, to create nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world and to ban all tests of nuclear, chemical and neutron weapons. The members of the assembly called for the conclusion of a treaty banning the militarization of outer space.

The CPSU and the Soviet state approach problems of the development of the entire movement from the principle-minded positions of Marxist-Leninist theory. The intensifying influence of the public on shaping the foreign policy of the various states is considered by the communists as one of the manifestations of the steadily increasing role which the people's masses play in history and as a law of social development. They believe that this is of tremendous importance to the cause of peace and the successful struggle for the termination of the arms race.

The CPSU is pursuing the Leninist line of addressing itself to the peoples and governments on the most topical and relevant international problems. This line was started with the first Soviet decree--the Decree on Peace--and may be traced throughout all stages in the history of our state. "Today, more than ever before, the peoples are emerging on the proscenium of history," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said at the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. "They have acquired the right to vote, which no one can suppress. They are capable of energetic and purposeful actions in eliminating the threat of nuclear war and preserving peace and, therefore, life on our planet. The CPSU and the Soviet government will do everything possible to ensure this."

The peace movement is developing its slogans and requirements in an autonomous and sovereign fashion. Even leaders, mainly in the Reagan administration, who only a few years ago tried to prove that the peace movement was being "manipulated by Moscow" were forced to abandon this thesis, for such a blatant lie triggered the extreme indignation of participants in the peace movement, particularly those whose ideological positions are quite different from the communists' but who are actively and convincingly working for the elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

Many of the demands of the peace movement are taken into consideration and implemented in the foreign policy initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. This confirms yet once again the fact that the general line of the foreign policy of these countries and the specific initiatives based on it are objectively consistent with not only the interests

of their nations but the entire peace-loving public on earth, those who are struggling in the various countries against the threat of nuclear war and for detente, an end to the arms race and defense of the sovereign rights and freedoms of all nations.

It is precisely this circumstance that also explains why in the socialist countries the fighters for peace do not have to oppose the governments of their countries. Whereas in the socialist countries social peace movements and governments act as partners using different methods and working in different areas of international relations for the sake of the single objective of preserving the peace, the same could in no way be said of relations between peace movements and governments in imperialist countries. The latter see in the movement not a force with which they could and should cooperate but a factor which hinders the implementation of their objectives and opposes their policy "from a position of strength" and the consequent line of intensifying the arms race, suppressing liberation movements and encouraging local military conflicts and, as a result of all this, aggravating the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe.

That is why, the more the antiwar movement grows and strengthens, the more active become the efforts of the imperialist ideological, political and police-administrative apparatus, aimed at maximally weakening the effectiveness and scope of antiwar, antinuclear and antimissile actions or even dealing physically with their participants. Some strata in the antiwar movement show themselves receptive of the erroneous programs, slogans or individual specific requirements and ideological-political concepts such as the theses of "equal responsibility," "bloc policy" or distorted interpretation of the nature of events in Poland or Afghanistan.

The imperialist mass information and special services have launched an unparalleled campaign for the disorientation of the participants in the peace movement by deliberately distorting the true ratio of military potentials of the USSR and the United States and the Warsaw Pact and NATO with a view to frightening them with the "Soviet military threat." They are trying to give a false line to the antiwar movement. Particularly noticeable of late have become attempts to lead the Western European antiwar movement away from its main objective, which is to prevent the deployment of new American missiles in Europe. It may be expected that were such a deployment to begin, forcing corresponding measures on the part of the socialist countries, such a campaign will become even more hysterical.

On the one hand, in order to harm the antiwar movement, accusations continue to be made to the effect that it allegedly operates on Moscow's orders and incitement. On the other, efforts are being made to "make arrangements" with this movement and even to flatter it. It is claimed, for example, that NATO is a defensive organization and that it goes along with this movement. Things have gone so far that Reagan himself has said that he sympathizes "with all his heart and soul" with people who are speaking of the horrors of nuclear war. At the same time, efforts are being made to insinuate in the movement the idea of the futility of the struggle and the fact that no mass actions can prevent the implementation of U.S. and NATO plans for so-called

further armament." Thus, efforts are made both to discredit the movement and to disarm it politically or, in other words, initially to restrain and then try to turn it against the foreign policy of the socialist states.

The greatest danger facing the movement comes from attempts to divide it. Efforts are being made above all to contrast the antiwar movement in the West against the public in the socialist countries on grounds that, allegedly, it must always have an adversary relationship with the authorities. Differences and rivalries between the Western antiwar organizations and movements with different political and ideological orientations are instigated and provoked. A course has been charted of separating military experts, physicians and scientists from antiwar organizations in order to deprive the former of their mass base of support and the latter of the possibility of achieving a competent understanding of the complex problems of disarmament, consequences of nuclear war, and others.

Of late the opponents of the antiwar movement have applied increasing efforts to pit against each other so-called "traditional" and "new" antiwar organizations. They are trying to lessen the role and significance of the "old" organizations and social groups which have fought for peace for long years and decades. All possible means are used to present matters as though the purposes of these organizations differ. The results of the Prague Assembly convincingly refuted all such provocations.

The report on the dialogue conducted at the Prague Assembly on exchanging experience and ideas among the peace movements with a view to helping disarmament especially emphasized that "it is exceptionally important to the peace movement to oppose the attempts of its enemies to undermine its unity and create a "cold war" atmosphere directly within the movement.... We must give priority to that which unites rather than divides us. It is only with the help of joint and parallel actions that the peace-loving forces will be able to win in the struggle for the common cause: to lift the threat of war and safeguard peace and life." It was a question of strengthening the interaction only among movements with different orientations, whether "traditional" or "new," but also organizations and movements operating in various parts of the globe. Thus, the participants in the discussion noted with great satisfaction that the peace movement in the United States is today fully conscious of the importance of the European problems in terms of the security of the American people themselves and is actively organizing mass actions against the placing of American missiles in Western Europe, cooperating in this area with the European antiwar organizations.

The participants in the other dialogue ("Threat of War and Problems of the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Latin America"), who realize that the nuclear threat is a global problem, particularly singled out "the importance of strengthening ties and cooperation among antiwar movements in Europe and the United States and the peace forces and liberation movements in the developing countries, with a view to the creation of a united front."

The peace-loving forces are ready to provide a firm rebuff to the imperialist efforts to initiate a new round in the monstrous arms race. Information

received from various parts of the world show that the autumn and winter of 1983 will be "hot." The antiwar organizations are preparing tremendous protest actions against the deployment of new American missiles.

The Soviet peace supporters, who are convinced of the truly peaceful nature of their socialist state, have already carried out impressive mass measures aimed against the arms race and the growing threat of nuclear war. They fully realize that the continuing aggravation of the international situation demands of them new and even more energetic efforts and intend to make their substantial contribution to mankind's struggle for peace and life.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/18

'PSYCHOPOLITICS' AND WHAT IT CONCEALS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83)
pp 102-112

[Article by Candidate of Psychological Sciences S. Roshchin]

[Text] Twenty years ago an unusual word--"psychopolitics"--appeared in the glossary of American psychiatrists and psychologists. The same word can be heard today, although it never became scientifically widespread. Nevertheless, it is used to indicate the actual policies pursued by the U.S. ruling circles and authorities, which has a specific theoretical substantiation and practical consequences. Such policies have two aspects or two areas of application which initially may seem to have nothing in common but which, in fact, prove to be interrelated. On the one hand, "psychopolitics" is a system of measures aimed at preserving and improving the mental health of the population; on the other, it means the use of psychiatric and psychological means and methods in the solution of acute political problems within American society. Let us consider what "psychopolitics" represents in both of its practical manifestations.

In the view of U.S. specialists, the question of the mental health of the American nation has become an exceptionally acute and complex problem. For example, the following data are cited in an article written by G. Albee, a University of Vermont psychologist, which was published in 1982 (G. W. Albee, "Preventing Psychopathology and Promoting Human Potential," AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGY, vol 37, No 9, 1982). He reports that according to a number of studies, including one by the special presidential commission on problems of mental health, between 32 and 34 million Americans (15 percent of the population) suffer from "emotional disturbances." This includes people suffering from functional psychoses, individuals who are unable to lead a normal life and work as a result of intensive neuroticism, victims of chronic depression, and so on. As Albee emphasizes, the entire system of medical institutions, including mental hospitals, clinics and private physicians, can help no more than 7 million Americans per year. This means that 25 to 27 million people who need medical help are unable to obtain it. Said figures, however, do not fully reflect the situation, for according to Albee, in addition to a "stable group" of sick persons, there always exists a large number of Americans who fall victim to mental and emotional disturbances as a result of one traumatic event or another, loss of job above all.

Even more frightening are the figures showing the spreading of mental illness in the United States and the inadequacy of medical services in this area, as

cited by a group of American specialists in the book "Mental Illness in the United States: Epidemiological Estimates," which came out in 1980 (by B. P. Dohrenwend et. al., New York, 1980). According to the authors, between 16 and 25 percent of the adult U.S. population from 20 to 65 years of age suffer from a variety of mental disturbances. Let us add to this figure no less than 12 percent of school-aged children and between 18 and 24.5 percent of sick people over 60. As the authors point out, approximately 40 percent of people suffering from psychoses have never received medical treatment. The most alarming conclusion is that statistical figures on mental disturbances in the United States are rising steadily. This is natural, for the basic factors which trigger a great variety of mental disturbances in the people are an organic and inseparable part of the economic and social system of capitalist society. The American scientists themselves identified quite convincingly the role of these factors. Thus, after analyzing the correlation between economic declines and statistical data about individuals who checked in as patients in mental clinics in the state of New York between 1841 and 1967, the sociologist M. Brenner determined that economic declines and related unemployment are "the most important source of fluctuations in the statistics of mental hospital patients" (M. H. Brenner, "Mental Illness and the Economy," Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1973. Cited from CONTEMPORARY PSYCHIATRY, vol 20, No 4, 1975, p 299). Most vulnerable in this case are family men aged between 30 and 65 with good education and earnings. The sudden loss of job becomes the reason for their acute stress, which frequently leads to mental disturbances and organic illnesses.

Similar conclusions have been reached by other American specialists. In his address to the annual session of the American Psychiatric Association, as early as 1971 Dr H. Modlin also pointed out that "each study of the reaction of workers to long unemployment becomes a study of mass neuroses. Therefore," he emphasizes, "the problem of mental health has become a political and economic problem as well..." (AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRY, vol 128, No 6, 1971, p 35).

The political nature of the problem is aggravated further by the fact that, as Albee writes, the social conditions in contemporary America "are responsible for a higher percentage of emotional disturbances among the poor, the rightless and the exploited" (G. W. Albee, "Preventing Psychopathology...", p 1,045).

The sober understanding of the situation by many American psychiatrists and psychologists has led them to conclusions which are virtually unattainable under the conditions of the capitalist society. Even the formulation of such conclusions in their consistent and completed aspect is by far not simple in contemporary America. For this reason, the soberly thinking specialists are frequently forced to limit themselves to rather general and abstract appeals. Dr Modlin, for example, calls upon psychiatrists and psychologists to "pay attention" to the main economic and political problems of society. Albee says that in order to eliminate the "dehumanizing influences" an "extensive and expensive social reform" is needed. He asks: Who will finance even the scientific substantiation for such a reform? S. Cleveland, head of the psychological service at the Veterans Administration Medical Center in

Houston, dots the "i"'s in this area. Discussing Albee's viewpoint, he writes that "unfortunately, from the viewpoint of his position and of eliminating the evil which, in his view, is the reason for the high level of unadaptability (of people to social conditions--the author), it would be necessary to abandon the capitalist socioeconomic system" (CONTEMPORARY PSYCHIATRY, No 3, vol 28, 1983, p 209). This is precisely the nature of the problem which psychiatrists and psychologists are unable to resolve.

As to the present U.S. administration, it has quite clearly expressed its view by drastically curtailing expenditures for social and medical needs, including scientific research in psychology and mental health.

The nature and meaning of the other aspect of "psychopolitics" is, as we said, the use of psychiatry and psychology in resolving ideological and political problems. It frequently happens that the members of these humane professions, whether they wish it or not, find themselves in the position of "educators," judges and jailers. This happens when seeming health care measures have an ideological and political underlining. In order to imagine better the way this is achieved in practical terms we shall continue to cite most competent sources--American psychiatrists, psychologists, sociologists and jurists.

As early as 1963 the known psychiatrist T. Szasz exposed in his book, "Law, Liberty and Psychiatry," the sinister nature of the so-called "therapeutic state," in which problems of ideology and politics are resolved through psychiatry. Already then, in his view, the United States had entered the path of turning into a "therapeutic state." "This conceals a most serious danger," Szasz wrote, "for in the course of its therapeutic aspirations the government is not satisfied with offering help. Hiding behind the classical principle that 'the doctor knows best,' it is ready and willing to force the 'patients' to undergo 'treatment' even if the patient objects. This creates a parallel between political and moral fascism. Both offer some kind of protection and the value concepts of the state are imposed by force on those who are unwilling to yield to peaceful persuasion; under political fascism this is achieved through the armed forces and the police; under moral fascism, the help of psychotherapists, psychiatrists in particular, is used. I think that we are rapidly approaching the time of the therapeutic state. Perhaps we are already in it but have not realized it yet" (T. Szasz, "Law, Liberty and Psychiatry." New York, 1963, p 248).

Certain theoretical prerequisites exist for the practical implementation of such specific functions assigned to psychiatry and clinical psychology. The essence of these postulates is expressed in the principle of "blaming the victim." The meaning of this principle is very simple: if you are sick, poor, unemployed, lonely and unhappy, you are the only one to be blamed and the reasons lie in your "defectiveness." Society and the socioeconomic conditions in which society has put you have nothing to do with your situation. According to K. Archibald's apt expression, this approach means that "if the shoe does not fit, there is something wrong with your foot" (K. Archibald, "Alternative Orientations to Social Science Utilization," AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGY, vol 28, No 3, 1973, p 202). The principle of "blaming the victim" is rarely expressed openly. On the contrary, it is frequently combined with external

manifestations of concern, good considerations and wishes. This, however, does not change the nature of things. "Blaming the victim," writes the American sociologist W. Ryan, "is frequently concealed behind goodness and concern and accompanied by all kinds of traps and showy scientific statistics" (W. Ryan, "Blaming the Victim," New York, 1971, p 6).

Related to this principle is another theoretical premise, i.e., that of the clinical orientation in assessing human behavior. This means that any deviation in human behavior from the norms of American society--of the so-called middle class--is equated with mental disturbances. In other words, the schizophrenic, the drug addict, the criminal, and the fighter for democratic rights are classified within the same group of individuals "with deviant behavior." Thus, L. West, director of the Institute of Neuropsychiatry, divides the "rebellion" among American youth into three sorts: the first, the "green rebellion," includes the drug addicts; the second, the "red rebellion," consists of the "revolutionaries and radicals" (such as members of the "Students for a Democratic Society"); and the participants in the third, the "black rebellion," are members of black organizations. It was no accident that in 1972 this psychiatrist authored a project for the creation of a "center" for the identification of potential criminals among totally blameless people, including children. This project, which totally lacked any scientific justification, was warmly approved by Ronald Reagan, the then-governor of California.

In 1975 H. Hendin, director of the program for psychosocial research at the New York Policy Institute, suggested a similar but more detailed classification of young people. On the basis of a study of several hundred Columbia University students, he divided them into the following categories: individuals with "ordinary" mental disturbances, drug users, potential suicides, homosexuals, dropouts, impotents, and...revolutionaries (see H. Hendin, "The Age of Sensation," New York, 1975).

L. Ullman, a psychologist, explains the reason for analogies between members of social movements, for example, and people who suffer from mental disturbances. He writes that "a member of a social movement has a greater likelihood, 1) to be different in terms of some of his intentions, from his fellow citizens; 2) to feel disturbed and unhappy; 3) to be a cultural nonconformist in some areas. A member of a social movement is like an individual described as 'mentally ill.'" Ullman further cites the views of W. Cameron, a psychiatrist, who has expressed himself even more definitely on this subject. According to Cameron, "a social movement is not a material object. It is merely a sequential chain of human behaviors.... The social movement 'exists' only as an abstraction.... In this respect it is similar to what is described as a 'functional mental illness'" (L. P. Ullman, "Behavior Therapy as Social Movement," in "Behavior Therapy," Ed. C. M. Franks. New York, 1969, p 500). Ullman's words make clear the way such a transition is possible from politics to psychopathology. The point is that in such cases "normalcy" is considered as "support of group standards," while "abnormality" is a "retreat from the moral values of the ruling group such as, for example, the white middle class in the United States" (ibid., p 502).

We must point out for the sake of fairness that by far not all American psychologists and psychiatrists support such a clinical-therapeutic interpretation

of political phenomena. This can be seen in the statements of many specialists cited in this article. Nevertheless, the supporters of this view are quite numerous. They are guided not only by the theory but the practice of social studies. Here is an example: We know that in the 1960s a widespread wave of mass youth and student actions directed against the war in Vietnam and in defense of civil rights spread over the United States. The concerned authorities turned to psychologists and psychiatrists for help in the hope of finding an explanation for such actions and the means to fight them. In 1968 the Center for Behavioral Sciences Studies called upon psychological institutions in the United States to study the student movement on a countrywide scale.

The following were among the many questions asked of the scientists: What were the value systems of the participants in mass actions? If student troubles were a form of social movements, how did students become involved? How were a handful of students able to involve in a protest movement the broad masses of other students? And so on. Therefore, the psychologists were bluntly faced with a political problem. Naturally, most of the studies involved students with progressive or leftist views, for the activities of reactionary circles do not concern the American government. The results of the studies indicated that most of the participants tried to find the reasons for student troubles in anything other than American social and political reality. According to some, these reasons lay in mental deviations among the students participating in protest movements; the Freudians explained the political behavior of the young people in terms of their character features and purely psychoanalytical structures such as the insoluble "Oedipus complex," the extension of rebellion against parents to the state, and so on; others reduced everything to improper education at home. Only a few scientists, R. Flaks, for example, bluntly pointed out that youth actions were a reaction to the imperialist and militaristic policies of the American authorities. "Briefly stated," Flaks wrote, "I tried to prove the appearance of a fundamental incompatibility between the aspiration of the American national authorities to preserve their global empire and the social acknowledgement of the legitimacy of these authorities. Imperialist trends prevent the authorities adequately to meet the demands of the underprivileged strata. Such trends lead to a rule and social control of an antidemocratic nature and lower faith in the authorities" (R. Flaks, "Protest or Conform: Some Social Psychological Perspectives on Legitimacy." J. APPL. BEHAV. SCI., vol 5, No 2, 1969, pp 148-149).

The role of U.S. psychologists and psychiatrists is not limited merely to providing clinical interpretations of political phenomena. Today they have been called upon to go beyond problems of therapy and to start, as psychiatrist M. Jones advised, to train the healthy in the art of living. Essentially, the very idea of helping even healthy people who have found themselves in one difficult situation or another is not bad. Psychologists and psychiatrists can provide useful advice. The point is, however, that it is a question not of individual cases of difficulties of psychological or individual nature but of "educating" people to adapt to the unfair social conditions which exist in contemporary America and which cause difficulties which turn people into "victims."

In accordance with a law which was passed as early as 1963, the creation of a network of so-called mental health centers was undertaken in the United States. Each one of them was to service districts with a population ranging between 75,000 and 200,000 people. There were more than 700 such centers at the beginning of the 1980s. It was initially assumed that such centers would merely provide various types of help to individuals suffering from one emotional or mental disturbance or another. However, as early as 1966, according to the psychologist A. Iscoe, a shift "from classical psychopathological models" to "problems of life" and "active social action" was noted. Entire population groups, consisting above all of the low underprivileged strata, began to be considered as "clients" and "patients" of psychologists and psychiatrists, for, according to that same Iscoe, "the middle-class community already has specific mechanisms (adaptations for life--the author) and tried experience, which help them to achieve success. The lower socioeconomic strata have no such experience" (I. Iscoe, "Community Psychology and Competent Community," AMER. PSYCHOL., vol 29, No 8, 1974, p 609). The objective was "to create competent communities" capable of resolving their socioeconomic problems. In practice this means to "teach" the poor obediently to endure their poverty; the unemployed to tolerate unemployment; and the slum population to tolerate slums. In discussing such a "social action strategy," the well-known American psychologist J. Rappaport with three of his colleagues wrote in 1975 that "essentially, the social action strategy is more the result of political considerations than a serious attempt at exerting a positive impact on social conditions.... The model used is unimportant, be it medical or any other, providing that it is based on blaming the victim, whereas the roots of the problem lie in the social system... In simple terms, blaming the victim means using the intervention of the psychologist in order to adapt the individual to existing conditions which are in the first place to be blamed for the fact that he or she is a victim" (J. Rappaport, "Alternatives to Blaming the Victim or Environment," AMER. PSYCHOL., vol 30, No 4, 1975, p 525).

Other critical American scientists openly point out that giving people jobs and normal housing conditions would do far more for their mental health than the mental health centers. Nevertheless, the mental health centers remain open. In view of their sociopolitical function (and given the shortage of psychiatrists and psychologists), they are staffed by...clergymen and housewives from the middle class, who receive special training.

In addition to the network of such centers, a number of "critical situation intervention" centers were opened. They were organized on the basis of the "suicide prevention centers," but were assigned broader functions. "Critical situations" include a broadest possible range of phenomena from family disputes to street disturbances. It is natural, therefore, that the new centers work in close contact with the police. Psychologists have written books on work with the police and for the police, and books were even written jointly by psychologists and police personnel. Therefore, the features of the "therapeutic state" in the United States are becoming quite clear.

However, such features are being increasingly manifested in another area of "psychopolitics"--in the use of psychiatry as a method for social control and

exercise. Psychologists N. Caplan and S. Nelson published as early as 1973 an article which triggered a broad response among U.S. scientific circles. In discussing the method of "blaming the victim," they noted that the political functions of this method are that it makes it possible to discredit the criticism of the social system itself, to draw attention away from the potential causes of conflict in American society and to justify the "officially acknowledged mechanism of control over 'restless elements' among the population" (N. Caplan and S. Nelson, "On Being Useful," AMER. PSYCHOL., vol 28, No 3, 1973, p 210). Psychiatry is assigned a major role in this mechanism, for, as the noted American psychiatrist R. Leifer wrote, "Psychiatry, as a contemporary par excellence method for controlling faults and behavior, could become the main instrument used by the state to adapt the individual to its needs" (R. Leifer, "In the Name of Mental Health: The Social Functions of Psychiatry." New York, 1969. Cited from CONTEMP. PSYCH., vol 15, No 6, 1970, p 400).

Could this provide, although partially, an explanation for the fact that, according to law professor N. Kittrie, in the United States "for every criminal sent to jail there are more than four people jailed without a criminal charge" (N. Kittrie, "The Right to Be Different: Deviance and Enforced Therapy." Penguin Books, 1973. Cited from CONTEMP. PSYCH., vol 19, No 1, 1974, p 17). This applies to people placed in mental hospitals for mandatory treatment. In the United States, a country with the sad reputation of having the highest crime rate, the jails do not stand idle. Nevertheless, the number of "people jailed without criminal charges" is more than quadruple that of sentenced criminals. The figures speak for themselves, the more so if we recall the words of the American psychologists R. Ullmer and S. Franks to the effect that "socially unacceptable statements and actions are in themselves sufficient grounds for the hospitalization of just about anyone" (R. A. Ullmer and C. M. Franks, "A Proposed Integration of Independent Mental Health Facilities Into Behaviorally Oriented Social Training Programs." PSYCHOL. REPORT, vol 32, vol 73, p 96).

According to Kittrie, in justifying the mandatory locking up of people in mental hospitals, the "therapeutic state" announces the promulgation of rules more humane than those stipulated in criminal law and promises to be "more flexible" in controlling "antisocial behavior." Actually, in such cases "humaneness" and "flexibility" mean the violation of the most basic constitutional rights of American citizens. The point is that the method of mandatory "treatment," suitable to the authorities, lies precisely in the fact that it makes it possible to bypass ordinary judicial procedures and makes people entirely helpless by depriving them of all rights to give explanations and justifications and to defend themselves. "If you simply behave somewhat strangely and someone wants to pack you off to a psychiatric hospital, you may be facing serious problems. In many states your legitimate rights may be somewhat or mostly denied, rights which are usually guaranteed to criminals, including that of having an attorney, the right to a prompt hearing, the right to a trial by jury, the right to summon independent experts, the right to a court with standard rules of proof, and the right to avoid self-incrimination..." (C. W. Offir, "Field Report." PSYCHOL. TODAY, vol 8, No 5, 1974, p 66). This was stated by Dr of Psychological Sciences

C. Offir, who managed to collect extensive data on the situation in a number of U.S. mental hospitals, including individuals sent to them for mandatory treatment. Her report cites truly horrifying facts which became known only after official and unofficial investigations, in the course of which some of the patients were able to describe their situation and awaken public opinion. Let us begin with the fact that according to American law individuals undergoing mandatory treatment have the constitutional right to real treatment and that their civil rights are guaranteed. However, what kind of treatment could there be if, as the lawyer J. Dean discovered, a hospital in Alabama had only one physician with "some psychiatric training" for 5,000 (!) inmates. According to Dean, instead of treatment the patients were subjected to beatings, solitary confinement and physical violence. "... Urine and feces on the floor, insects crawling around the premises, and the extreme closeness and unbearable heat in the wards," is the description of two mental hospitals in Alabama given by C. Offir and J. Dean (*Ibid.*, p 64).

The physicians who investigated the St. Elizabeth Hospital outside Washington in 1971 determined that 68 percent of the patients showed no behavioral deviations. Nevertheless, even subsequently approximately 2,000 people were sent to that hospital annually for mandatory treatment. Clearly, the patients of such mental hospitals are the poor, the blacks and members of other "underprivileged" strata. It is no accident, in this connection, that blacks, for example, are declared mentally ill and sent to hospitals considerably more frequently than whites, although no proof whatsoever exists that mental illness is more widespread among blacks. In 1969 there were more than 540 people per 100,000 white Americans ages 25 to 44 assigned to mental hospitals, compared with 1,185 per 100,000 black Americans. Such is the practical "flexibility" of the "therapeutic state" in "controlling antisocial behavior."

So-called behavioral modification was a new term introduced in the practice of psychological and psychiatric methods for controlling human behavior, over the past 10-15 years. Let us describe briefly the theoretical postulates for this method in order to explain the meaning of this term. One of the leading trends in American psychology is "radical behaviorism," headed by B. F. Skinner ("behaviorism" comes from the word behavior--the author). The main concept of this trend is that man is considered not as an individual who, unlike animals, has a mind and the ability objectively to study the world and its laws and, on this basis, consciously to structure his life, but only as a being guided by a sum total of habits or habitual forms of behavior. According to the behaviorists, such habitual forms of behavior are developed on a purely mechanical basis, on the principle of the development of conditional reflexes. For example, if as a result of a specific action repeated several times a person is able to satisfy a specific need, this action becomes a habitual form of behavior, which is automatically repeated under the proper circumstances. According to Skinner, such an action ends with a "positive support." Conversely, if a given action leads to undesirable and unpleasant consequences, it is not "supported" and does not become the customary way for resolving one problem or another. In this case concepts which are inseparably linked to man and life in human society, such as consciousness, ideals, conscience, honor, love, dignity, freedom, democracy, and so on, are simply

rejected. They are considered fictitious, for according to Skinner anything which may be meant by such concepts simply does not exist. Love, for example, is merely a form of behavior aimed at "positive support" by the loved object.

Strange though such views of normally thinking people might seem, they have acquired extensive "publicity" in the United States and some other Western countries. The point is, that based on the ideas of behaviorism, Skinner suggested a program for the global reorganization of society with a view to the creation of a so-called "programmed culture." The essence of this program is to create the type of living conditions under which the people will automatically, regardless of their will and desire, develop only the customary means of behavior which would be suitable, acceptable and profitable to the capitalist society. In other words, nothing should distinguish the citizens of this "new" society from programmed robots. According to Skinner, this would eliminate the problems of revolutions and the class and national liberation struggle. All that is needed is to develop a suitable "technology for controlling the behavior" of the people. The people themselves would in this case become happy and derive total satisfaction from life with no efforts whatsoever.

Despite the entire scientific groundlessness of such ideas, they proved to be greatly to the liking of reactionary bourgeois ideology, the more so since, as some American scientists have justifiably acknowledged, they are "an alternative to contemporary Marxism." For the sake of fairness, let us say that most Western, including American, psychologists, philosophers and sociologists express a sharply critical view of the idea of "programmed culture," and that Skinner himself was sadly forced to acknowledge that in the course of the discussion of his book which caused a great stir in the West (B. F. Skinner, "Beyond Freedom and Dignity," New York, 1972), the word "fascism" was mentioned all too frequently.

Nevertheless, it is precisely such views which became the base of the method of behavioral modification, which has now become widespread in the United States. The method's system is easy to understand if compared with animal training: desirable actions are automatically encouraged while undesirable are punished. It is true that Skinner himself officially proclaims the rejection of all punishment and calls for the use of "positive support" exclusively. In practice, however, this proves to be pure demagoguery. For example, he says that in his "programmed culture" society, anyone could criticize the power system "freely" and "with impunity" but should not, in such a case, hope for "positive support" expressed in terms of...having a good job. One can easily see that Skinner's idea has been long anticipated by some capitalist countries who practice "professional bans." The victims of such bans are above all communists, trade union activists and other individuals who oppose various forms of injustice in capitalist society.

Other supporters of behaviorism such as, for example, the British psychologist Isenck, suggested that behavioral modification include the methods of aversion therapy or the "repulsion therapy." As we shall see later this is a system of refined punishment coded with pseudoscientific interpretations.

Behavioral modification was initially applied in psychiatric hospitals and then in correctional institutions, kindergartens and schools. The question even arose of the application of this method in all realms of life of American society. K. Goodal wrote as early as 1972 that "whereas behaviorist technology has some possibilities of achieving Skinner's ambitious aspiration of reconstructing all culture, it should be applied virtually from cradle to grave and, as I found out, after studying the programs for 'living environment' of Todd Risley in Kansas, this is already taking place. Such programs begin with crawling toddlers in kindergartens, and go through children in preschool groups, adolescents in the Juniper Gardens Child Center, adults in tenant associations and the aged in a private home for mentally retarded in Lawrence" (K. Goodal, "Shapers at Work," PSYCHOLOGY TODAY, vol 6, No 6, 1972, pp 136-137).

The behavior modification method has a variety of forms, some of which are relatively innocuous. However, it acquired its most sinister aspect in recent years in detention centers. In 1977 a report of the special national commission for the protection of individuals tested in biomedical and behavioral studies published its report. The reason for the creation of the commission was the numerous communications on the conduct of various experiments on people, inmates in particular, either without their agreement or with their forced acceptance. Although the commission was appointed by the government, for which reason it was not particularly interested in exposing violations of basic civil rights in the United States, it nevertheless was forced to admit to many unseemly cases. Let us recall that after World War II, when the crimes committed by fascist "researchers" in concentration camps became known to the world public, the Nuremberg code was adopted, which bans experiments on people who cannot give their voluntary agreement. The United States has signed this code. The commission was forced to admit that the U.S. authorities have systematically violated the norms of this international document.

As to the measures which were implemented with the participation of psychiatrists and psychologists, the commission noted that aggressive behavior was experimentally corrected with the help of pharmacological drugs and aversion methods (use of electric shock or drugs inducing unpleasant effects) and behavior modifications based on depriving the inmates of elementary facilities which they were forced to earn as a privilege.... Extreme cases in research or correction practices included castration for rapists and psychosurgery in cases of uncontrolled aggressiveness" ("Research Involving Prisoners. National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects," FEDERAL REGISTER, vol 42, No 10, 1977, p 3,081).

It is very important to point out that the purpose of one "corrective" procedure or another, including psychosurgical (brain surgery, among others) took place in violation of basic norms of law and ethics of medicine and only on the basis of decisions made by the prison authorities or the prison psychiatrist. For this reason anyone, political prisoners above all, could be the victims of such procedures.

On the basis of information obtained from inmates, in its 15 January 1977 issue the periodical THE NATION reported on the type of individuals who are

subjected to behavioral modifications. Its editorial stated that a special "controlled block" was set up in a prison in Marion, Illinois, for behavioral modification. This block was for inmates considered excessively "difficult" in terms of ordinary jails. Eighty percent of these "hard cases" were members of national minorities, including the Black Muslims, heads of the "Black Cultural Society" and others who had tried to fight for their rights. In order to avoid "punishments" and resort only to "encouragement," initially the inmates were deprived of all basic rights which they were subsequently forced to earn as "bonuses." They were placed in isolation, and had no contact with the outside world. They were not allowed to read, write or even work. They had no right to correspond with relatives or receive visitors. "It is impossible for a free person to understand life in the controlled block," said one of the inmates. "To understand it you should lock yourself in your bathroom, stretch in the tub and spend 3 years there." The national commission we mentioned not only confirmed the practice of such "rehabilitation programs" but also noted that in addition to the Marion jail it was practiced in other prisons as well. The commission was also forced to acknowledge that behavioral modification programs are nonscientific and are a method of punishment rather than rehabilitation.

Behavioral modification, as a rule, is supplemented by "aversion therapy." "Corrective" means are used even for the slightest violations of the rules. Preparations are administered to the inmate which may cause, for example, his breathing to stop for several minutes. This triggers a panicky feeling of fear of death, for the person indeed begins to die, or else chemicals which trigger lengthy and painful vomiting.

We can only agree with the view of a group of American psychologists, who write that although officially the programs for behavioral modification should help the people "to lead a better life," in fact, "instead of this, unfortunately, such programs teach obedience to the authorities" (C. B. Stolz et. al., "Behavior Modification," AMER. PSYCHOL., vol 35, No 11, 1975, p 1,040). This is the entire social and political meaning of one of the new "psychopolitical" methods.

The main thing is that prisons may turn out to be merely a testing ground for the development of a "technology" for social control and coercion methods based on Skinner's "programmed culture." As J. McConnell wrote, "We must restructure our society in such a way that we are raised from birth to want and do what society wants of us" (J. V. McConnell, "Criminals Can Be Brainwashed Now," PSYCHOL. TODAY, April 1970, p 74). All we can add to this is that it is a question of a capitalist society with all its vices and faults. What is contemplated here is the use not only of modification of behavior with its false "encouragements" but many other ways and means of affecting the mind and behavior of the people, developed by contemporary psychiatry and psychology. No one intends to ask the permission of the American citizens for the use of such means. "... It is easy to anticipate," J. Rogers writes, "the day when foreign citizens will have to take daily doses of psychopharmacological drugs in order to ensure a type of behavior which the government in power would consider desirable" (J. M. Rogers, "Drug Abuse--Just What the Doctor Ordered," PSYCHOL. TODAY, vol 5, No 4, 1971, p 24). Skinner and his

followers intend to go even farther. Thus, P. London, a professor of psychology and psychiatry, has suggested an entire system of methods according to which "agreement by coercion" in the capitalist society would be replaced by "structured agreement." To this effect, he believes, one could and should control the behavior of citizens through psychotherapy, hypnosis, mandatory use of pharmacological means, electric shock and even implantation of micro-electrodes in the brain to activate certain sections of the brain in order to create in the people the necessary state and mood. Let us reemphasize that it is not a question of treating patients or even of individuals who have committed crimes but of means which can influence healthy citizens in the interest of developing a "structured agreement" (see P. London, "Behavior Control," New York, 1969). B. S. Brown, the director of the National Institute of Mental Health, bluntly stated in 1975 that the federal government is encouraging research in methods for the modification of behavior and favors the extension of such methods and their application "to a broader circle of people" (see B. S. Brown, "Behavior Modification: Perspective on a Current Issue," Washington, 1975), more extensively than in the past.

Such are the two sides of the "psychopolitics" currently exercised in the United States, and which is now an inseparable part of the American way of life. T. Szasz's sinister prophecy on the advent of the "therapeutic state" era, expressed in 1963, is turning into a dangerous reality.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/18

COUNTERREVOLUTION FOR EXPORT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83)
pp 113-114

[Article by V. Nikolayev]

[Text] One of the alarming characteristics of the contemporary national situation, as noted in the joint declaration which was adopted at the June meeting of heads of the seven socialist countries in Moscow, is the following: "The current hotbeds of military tension are worsening and new ones are created along with crisis situations in various parts of the world; undeclared wars are being waged on a number of independent countries; foreign military presence, alien to the national interests, is being implanted." The interventionist steps recently taken by Washington in Central America confirm the accuracy of this warning concerning the threat to peace caused by the current intensification of imperialist policy of force and diktat, for the threat of nuclear war hanging over mankind is caused not only by the global aspirations of extreme reactionary circles in the United States and its NATO allies but their aggressive actions on the regional level as well.

Unable to cope with the upsurge of the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of Central America and to suppress their mass actions against corrupt dictatorial regimes by supporting the local counterrevolutionary forces with money, weapons and military advisers, the White House opted for a strategy of drastic aggravation of the tension with actual direct armed intervention by the United States in the internal affairs of the area. Therefore, American fleets with marines on board are sailing along coastal areas in the Pacific and Caribbean. Exercises with the participation of thousands of American troops have been initiated on Honduran territory, which the interventionists have turned into their main base. The task set for the American expeditionary corps, the largest since the war in Vietnam, sent to Central America, is to instill fear in the peoples of revolutionary Nicaragua and the Salvadoran patriots engaged in a war of liberation. Clearly, the subsequent task will be to suppress all national liberation forces with an iron fist, thus teaching an object lesson to nations in Latin America and other continents, which oppose the domination of monopoly capital, American above all.

It is in vain that Reagan, the head of the White House, is describing such events as merely "exercises," and denying plans for military intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign countries. The U.S. President is being refuted by his own subordinates, who are openly stating that the purpose of

the exercise is a preparation for blockade and that the navy at the Central American shore can be fully "used for attack purposes." The President himself refuses to exclude the possibility of direct participation of the U.S. expeditionary corps in suppressing the national liberation forces.

The dangerous nature of the steps taken by the current administration and its aggressiveness can be clearly seen outside the White House and beyond the borders of the United States. Reagan's complaint to the effect that the American people are insufficiently "unaware" of the entire "loftiness" of his aspiration "to put an end to violence and bloodshed" in the area merely proves the futility of the efforts to conceal the true purpose of Washington's current activities. Their nature, as a prelude to broad interventionist actions against Nicaragua, is an open secret. Nor will the various provocations, preparations for which have been reported by the world press, aimed at justifying aggression, mislead the broad international public. Did the American military not use the Tonkin Gulf provocation in their time in order to escalate the intervention in Vietnam!

In precisely the same way as in the past, but with greater scope and cynicism. A propaganda campaign is being currently waged in an effort to ascribe some kind of loftiness of reasons and objectives to this regular bloody imperialist campaign waged in the defense of its privileges and profits. "In Central America, as anywhere else," President Reagan complains, "we support democracy, reforms and human freedom." Not so long ago the peoples of Indochina learned through personal experience the type of support they could receive, after experiencing the tactic of the scorched earth and the so-called "blanket bombing" and the horrors of My Lai, which reminded mankind of Hitlerite crimes. The same methods are used today in the struggle against the Palestinian people by Washington's fellow workers and trainees in Tel Aviv and similar methods are used by the South African racists. The broader the fronts of the nationwide liberation struggle become throughout the world, the more inhuman become the imperialist actions wherever the military-repressive imperialist machinery can reach out. This is a clear manifestation of the law of the class struggle in the contemporary world. Recently the world witnessed yet another imperialist sally, this time in Africa, where the American neocolonizers and their allies are trying to strike at the liberation movement of the African nations by interfering in the domestic conflict in Chad and increasing tension around Libya.

This is not the first time that the Reagan administration is trying to instill in the American people and world public opinion the idea that its approach to events in the Central American region is exclusively defensive and based on the need to counter some malicious "outside forces," which is a reference to the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, Cuba above all. Totally ignored in this case is the firm opinion of authoritative figures as X. Perez de Cuellar, UN secretary general, according to whom socioeconomic problems are the root of the crisis.

The White House frightens others with a certain threat which allegedly could be hanging virtually over the southern borders of the United States itself, unless prompt measures are taken. The United States is describing itself as a fighter for peace, providing a shield to protect the peaceful life and development of all nations in the Western hemisphere, whereas in fact, it is

violating the elementary norms of international law, unceremoniously trampling on the principles of sovereign equality among countries, noninterference in their domestic affairs, abandonment of the use of force and respect for the rights of peoples freely to choose their political, economic and social systems, codified in the United Nations charter, the Final Act of the European Conference, the charter of the Organization of American States and other international documents.

The export of counterrevolution, like that of capital, is an indivisible component of the policy of imperialism expressing its expansionist nature and anti-people's aspirations. No single truly social revolution in the 20th century has been accepted by monopoly capital as historically inevitable. Starting with the Great October Socialist Revolution, always and everywhere counterrevolutionary campaigns from the outside have been mounted against such revolutions in order to strangle them and to punish the people's masses who dared to take the path of radical reorganization of their own life. Today the role of global policeman and suppressor of the revolution has been taken over by American imperialism, whose policy is invariably aimed at promoting everywhere new and "preserving" existing anti-people's regimes.

What makes Washington's rulers even more enraged is the refusal of the peoples to obey in places which the United States has long considered its own domain. Latin America was proclaimed by Washington 160 years ago in the notorious "Monroe Doctrine" the preserve for U.S. capital. It is precisely for Latin America that at the turn of the century the policy of the "big stick," thus named by U.S. president Theodore Roosevelt, was practiced. Today this policy has once again been dusted off and suggestions regarding a political settlement formulated by the Latin American countries, which meet with a positive response by Nicaragua and Cuba, are "thrown in the garbage can" by the White House, to use a NEWSWEEK expression.

In the alarming situation worsened by the rattling of Pentagon arms, the peoples of revolutionary Nicaragua and socialist Cuba are retaining their self-control, preparing themselves for all kinds of surprises, aware of the fact that the objective trend of global developments is on their side. In our age, when the struggle for national freedom is becoming increasingly intertwined with social revolutions, which are restructuring the very foundations of social life, with increasing frequency the various efforts at counterrevolutionary exports are failing. The revolutionaries are not short of resolve in their battles against temporarily superior enemy forces. The solidarity of the peoples of this volcanic continent known as Latin America is on the side of Nicaragua and Cuba and so are the members of the socialist commonwealth, who call for an end to the policy of constant threats and provocations against Cuba and Nicaragua and attempts to interfere in their internal affairs.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/18

COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO REDUCING MANUAL LABOR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83)
pp 115-121

[Letters to the editors]

[Text] The elaboration and implementation of the comprehensive target program for reducing the use of manual labor has been defined by the party as one of the most important tasks for the current five-year plan and through 1990. This was the topic of the article "Shifting Manual Labor to Machines" (KOMMUNIST, No 11, 1981). The author considered conditions which required a faster pace in saving on labor outlays; he summed up the acquired experience and described specific shortcomings in this work.

The journal's readers expressed in their answers their view on some of the questions raised in the article.

The documents of the 26th CPSU Congress call for steadily reducing in all national economic sectors the number of workers engaged in manual labor, particularly in auxiliary and secondary operations. This is no accident. Experience proves that reducing the share of production workers doing manual work in many cases does not lead to a decline in their absolute number. Yet capital investments in auxiliary production are recovered faster than in basic production by a factor of 4-5 and relieve more manpower resources by a factor of 3-6.

Candidate of economic sciences L. Danilov points out in his letter that "the particular attention paid to basic production is determined by the fact that the currently used planning and incentive indicators direct the enterprise (association) above all toward increasing its volume of output. Technical policy as well obeys the notorious "gross." The investment of funds in basic production increases the volume of output while the mechanization of auxiliary processes does not as a rule. The existing shortcomings in cost-effectiveness make it possible to ensure the "gross output" at any cost even at the cost of increasing manpower outlays. When an enterprise replaces one machine tool with another, which is more productive, complex and expensive in its basic production area and thus saves labor of one or two workers, it totally ignores the fact that the growing volume of labor objects related to these machines requires an increasing army of manual loading workers and auxiliary personnel."

Today ministries and departments have dozens of scientific councils and commissions on problems of comprehensive mechanization and automation of loading-unloading and warehousing operations. However, no one is coordinating their activities. As a result, the numerous senders and receivers of freight frequently apply uncoordinated mechanization facilities (some of which are non-standard or "home-grown"), and disparate assemblies of lifting equipment. Freight haulage in containers and packets is also developing too slowly. Yet, as computations indicate, the increased volume of transportation of so-called "consolidated destinations" reduces metal outlays for containers by 2,000 tons and of timber by 100,000 cubic meters per million tons. In such cases freight car idling is reduced by one-half; truck idling is reduced by a factor of 5-6 while that of maritime and riverine ships, by a factor of 8-10. Finally, from 800 to 1,500 workers are released from heavy manual work. Departmental lack of coordination is a particularly severe hindrance to the overall approach to the organization of the efficient work of intermediary enterprises.

A. Goliusov, chief of the Southeastern Railroad, notes that packet and container haulage ensures the total safety of the freight and considerably reduces the labor-intensiveness of loading and unloading operations and, consequently, enhances labor productivity. Over the past 10 years transportation in large-freight containers along the Southwestern Railroads increased by 37 percent while that in transportation packets by 48 percent. "Today the enterprises serviced by the railroad," the author writes, "annually ship more than 7 million tons of goods in packets. Whereas previously its loading and unloading required the work of more than 1,300 loading workers, today it requires no more than 210 mechanizers. The cost of such operations has been reduced by a factor of 4." He also writes that "a large amount of freight continues to be hauled through the old method. For example, brick plants in Voronezh, Lipetsk, Tambov, Rostov and other oblasts ship their freight in bulk. The reason is **lack of** departmental coordination. The question of shipping goods in transport packets was quickly and successfully resolved at the Semilukskiy Refractory Materials Plant, because both senders and recipients are enterprises under a single administration--the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy. The brick plants are under the jurisdiction of the RSFSR Ministry of Construction Materials Industry while their consumers are the USSR Ministry of Construction and the RSFSR Ministry of Rural Construction. The former are not interested in organizing packet shipments of bricks, for this involves additional outlays. Clearly, the USSR Gosplan and USSR Gossnab should find a way to lift departmental barriers."

The 26th Congress called for upgrading the quality and level of standardization of containers and packaging materials and to improve the use of recirculated and returnable containers. This situation, however, is being improved all too slowly. Many readers describe the negligent and barbaric attitude toward containers. In particular, Yu. Imanov (Leningrad), who works for the hydrographic enterprise of the Ministry of Maritime Fleet, points out that "I have worked in the Arctic for more than 20 years and I am well-acquainted with the container situation in many large and small settlements. Some 10-15 years ago containers were burned in bakeries or private homes. Managers were even given credit for their use as fuel. They were considered thrifty and

concerned with the use of even "throwaway" materials. Subsequently, the bakeries converted to electric power and private homes are currently heated with coal so that currently, whenever a ship docks, huge bonfires are set for containers and most valuable timber is being destroyed. Yet possibilities exist for taking the containers back as most ships leave Arctic ports empty."

The national economy is experiencing an acute shortage of various types of containers. As the press has repeatedly noted, packaging and shipping out the produce grown in gardens and fields frequently proves to be more complex than the growing and processing of the harvest. During the past five-year plan, for example, the average annual per capita consumption of fruits and vegetables increased considerably more slowly than output. One of the main reasons for this disparity was losses in their transportation from the fields to the stores.

M. Aganin, chief of the Main Cooperative Fruit and Vegetable Administration, writes that the procurement organizations are suffering from an acute shortage of electric and motor lift trucks (no more than 25-30 percent of requests for such items by Tsentrosoyuz are met). For this reason, only a small part of the potatoes, vegetables, fruits and melon crops are transported in containers and packets. Year after year the trade organizations fail to fulfill their plans for the delivery of specialized containers. The containers which are received are imperfect. They are frequently in poor condition and are shipped with delays. No unionwide instruction has been drafted on the procedure governing the use of and payment for containers (specialized cases) for the transportation of potatoes, vegetables and melon crops. All of this prevents the implementation of the resolutions of the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee plenum, which call for reducing losses of fruits and vegetables in their procurement, transportation and storage and reducing the number of workers performing manual labor.

The problem of the manufacturing and efficient utilization of containers has long exceeded departmental frameworks. Its successful solution depends on the joint coordinated activities of industrial enterprises and procurement, transportation, trade and supply organizations and the rational use of timber. We know that 1 ton of container cardboard, the manufacturing of which requires 4.5 cubic meters of low-grade timber, replaces 15 cubic meters of round timber used in the manufacturing of wooden cases. However, the number of wooden cases produced in the country is triple that of cardboard boxes.

N. Lykov, head of Soyuzglavtara, writes on steps taken for the development and production of economical container varieties. In particular, the USSR Gosstab stipulates container standardization in its intersectorial 1982-1985 coordination plan. Steps have been taken to ensure the reliability, durability and reusability of containers, reducing material intensiveness and lowering the number of sizes. A program was approved aimed at ensuring the comprehensive mechanization, automation and reduction of manual work in freight processing along the entire chain from supplier to consumer. The ministries of chemical and petroleum machine building, instrument making, automation equipment and control systems, machine building for light and food

industry and household appliances, and construction, road and municipal machine building will organize the development and manufacturing of high-efficiency equipment for the manufacturing of containers made of paper and corrugated and flat glued cardboard and the recycling of wooden containers unsuitable for reuse. The USSR Ministry of Timber, Pulp and Paper and Wood-Processing Industry, USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances, USSR Ministry of Fish Industry and USSR Ministry of Meat and Dairy Industry will develop specialized capacities for the production of cardboard and polyethylene containers, trays, and sets of parts for reusable containers. "The decisions of the Interdepartmental Container Council," N. Lykov writes, "have become mandatory for all ministries and departments. This enables us better to coordinate scientific research and experimental design and to formulate technical policy.... The USSR Gosnab has drawn up lists of goods to be transported in packets, containers and lightweight packaging or without them."

The further increase in the production and improved efficiency of the structure of lifting equipment facilities and the mass delivery of freight with the most advanced technology offer the best opportunities for reducing manual (particularly heavy physical) labor and improving working conditions.

Comprehensive production automation and mechanization and the creation and utilization of facilities which would take over manual human operations are the main way to resolving the problem of manpower shortages. The formulation of a special program for the development of industrial robots plays a particularly important role in its resolution. The effort of scientists and designers are focused on the use of robot technology not only in machine building but in many other economic sectors. Unfortunately, as our readers report, the production of robots continues to increase too slowly. Frequently the developers duplicate their efforts and create various models of automated manipulators performing identical functions. The letters suggest the need for testing and eliminating unsuitable solutions and introducing a competitive system for resolving automation problems, as is practiced in architecture, and the production of robots made of standardized assemblies, for the pursuit of originality is very costly to the national economy. They call for the creation of a specialized industrial organization for robot manufacturing, which would consist of a scientific research institute and a powerful production base.

This organization," writes Ye. Popov, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, "should not be under the jurisdiction of any single ministry or department. It must mandatorily be set up on the all-union level. In my view, it should have the following tasks: formulate technical policy on a national scale in the area of comprehensive production automation with the utilization of robots and computers, develop the technological principles governing the structure and system of management of fast retuneable production facilities, assess and conduct industrial tests of developed robots, including foreign-made, and formulate recommendations for their series production or purchasing abroad. Such a specialized organization should also help enterprises in all sectors (machine building in particular) in the use of industrial robots; together with them it should determine priorities in the use of automatic

manipulators, select suitable robots among existing models, determine the need for their updating, and so on. All of this will enable us to save substantial funds and manpower resources and greatly to accelerate the development of robotics in all economic sectors."

The development, servicing and repair of robots will require highly skilled specialists who should be trained as new technical mechanization facilities are developed. Ye. Popov writes that on the basis of the MVTU [Moscow Higher Technical School] imeni N. E. Bauman, the training of such specialists has been initiated in a number of VUZs. The retraining of engineers in robotics has been organized but, unfortunately, so far on a minor scale. This work is being coordinated by the USSR Academy of Sciences Robotekhnika Scientific Research Center and the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education. The center is also engaged in research and development of long-range problems of industrial robotics. Its activities are closely related to the operations of the scientific-methodical council of the Moscow city party committee.

The servicing and repair of the latest technical facilities will require not only engineers and technicians but equipment tuners and operation workers. V. Akakiyev, chief of the machine-building and communications worker training department, USSR State Vocational Training Administration, informs the editors that the Unified Rate-Skill Manual for Worker Jobs and Professions (YeTKS) has now added a new skill: "tuner of programmed machine tools and manipulators." The training of such specialists (1,138 people) is already under way in 36 schools. Furthermore, the curricula for training tuners of hammer-press, casting, molding, electric and gas welding and other equipment have been supplied with the necessary training materials for the tuning and servicing of automated manipulators. Such cadres are being trained in 176 schools. Nevertheless, these changes are insufficient. After determining the needs of some ministries and departments, the USSR State Vocational Training Administration estimated that this five-year plan 15,000 such skilled workers will be needed in the machine-building sectors alone.

Many difficulties are caused by the lack of textbooks and training aids for teachers and school production training foremen. "The energetic publication of such books is today difficult, naturally," writes T. Korovina, deputy head of laboratory at the All-Union Scientific-Methodical Center for Youth Vocational Training. "We are publishing a series of 16 pamphlets which will essentially cover the new curricula and changes in robotics.... In the future a structure will be developed for curricula and programs and steps will be taken to centralize the publication of necessary textbooks."

The use of comprehensive production mechanization and automation is inseparably related to the solution of many social problems.

For example, L. Fatyukh, head of the chair of economics, Zaporozhye Machine-Building Institute, notes that today the enterprises have quite a lot of equipment. However, it is occasionally improperly used due to lack of personnel (sometimes the shift coefficient does not exceed level 1). Automated and highly mechanized equipment helps substantially to upgrade labor

productivity, to organize multiple-machine servicing and to reduce manual labor. It would be expedient to take into consideration economy and increased production efficiency by improving the shift coefficient and social production factors (working conditions, the nature and attractiveness of the job, etc.), as well as other factors, in establishing the corresponding correction coefficients. "It is not a question of developing a new method," writes L. Fatyukha, "but only of expanding the existing method in order to ensure the fuller consideration of the effect from the release of workers and the solution of social problems. This will greatly increase the urgency of reducing manual labor and industrial enterprises."

Further improvements in planning are of very great importance in releasing manpower resources, including manual workers. Previously, each sector and area developed and applied their own methods for inventorying manual labor and formulating measures to reduce it, along with various types of planning and accounting of the results of such work. Now, on the basis of its single scientifically substantiated normative base and summation of progressive experience, we must standardize the entire methodical documentation available on curtailing manual labor.

Starting with 1981, ministries, associations and enterprises will be issued assignments on the share of workers engaged in manual labor. This new indicator has only recently been introduced in planning and it is so far difficult to determine the accuracy and comprehensiveness with which it reflects the results of enterprise activities in lowering manual labor outlays. However, as the authors of letters point out, it already shows a certain limitation and substantial waste.

G. Slutskiy, chairman of the VSNTO [All-Union Council for Scientific and Technical Societies] Committee for Scientific Organization of Labor writes that "to begin with, the proper normative base has not been laid under this indicator. Most frequently it is established arbitrarily, based "on achievements." Yet the possibilities of enterprises in reducing manual labor depend on a number of factors, such as the type of output, its technical standard, complexity, manpower structure, and so on. In this respect enterprises engaged in mass, series or customized output have entirely different possibilities.

Secondly, this indicator is not related to the system of indicators which characterize the material foundations for reducing manual labor outlays: increasing the technical level of output. At the present time such changes are assessed with the help of data proving the quantitative increase in the amount of automated and mechanized equipment and the increased number of workers doing mechanized work. It would be expedient to expand them with indicators reflecting the share of automated equipment in the overall volume of output and the reduction of manual labor and to formulate norms on the share of such labor for enterprises, shops and sectors with different levels of production mechanization and automation.

Thirdly, the "share of workers engaged in manual labor" indicator enables us to assess only the quantitative aspect of changes without giving us an idea of their qualitative side: increased meaningfulness of labor, improved labor conditions, and so on."

Some readers expressed a more categorical view on this problem. Thus, Scientific Associate T. Tsarenko (Kirovograd) considers that the indicator of "share of workers engaged in manual labor" is useless to begin with, for enterprises can lower it purely mechanically (without proper computations and substantiations). He suggests that enterprises be issued assignments on the absolute (real) release of workers converted from manual to mechanized labor and their number. "In order to ensure a more precise determination of the scale of manual labor, in our view, it would be expedient to establish its share in terms of labor intensiveness," T. Tsarenko writes. "In this case labor outlays would be computed not only for workers who, according to the method of the USSR Central Statistical Administration, are doing manual work but also among those who work with the use of machines, mechanisms, and automation."

The readers emphasize in their letters that the problem of reducing manual labor outlays cannot be considered merely as one of reducing the number of workers exclusively engaged in manual operations. Production workers operating with machines and mechanisms, such as machine tool workers, smelters, stampers, welders, and many others, lose a considerable amount of time on such operations.

For example, I. Rozenberg, senior scientific associate at the USSR Academy of Sciences Ural Scientific Center Economics Institute, writes that "the borer with the help of a crane puts a part weighing several tons on his machine tool, after which he must secure it with bolts and slats manually. Our observations show that in the machine-building plants in the Urals manual work by universal machine tool operators accounts for between 20 and 40 percent and, in some cases, as much as 50 percent of their working time. This is where we find the sources of manual labor which is basically as hard as that of a ditchdigger! It is largely because of this that skills such as machining, pressing, stamping and others have lost their prestige and, therefore, have led to labor shortages. Our technologists must think not only about more productive means for eliminating tailings, speeding up the work of presses, and so on, but also lowering outlays of auxiliary time among workers engaged in mechanized labor." The author takes to task designers and developers of machine tools who give little thought to reducing the additional time spent in tuning and setting the tools while converting from the machining of one surface to another. He also points out that manual labor in assembly operations could be reduced by making machine processing more precise (in machine building as much as 30 percent of the working time of assembling personnel is spent in fitting, filing, and scraping in series or customized production). This can be accomplished through die forging, precision casting, cold heading, etc.

Characteristic of the current stage in the development of our society are the increased interconnection and interdependence between economic and social progress. This predetermines the new and broader view on labor conditions as the most important prerequisite for the efficient, productive, rational and humane utilization of the main production force in society. Reducing the share of manual labor, heavy labor in particular, reducing job monotony, preventing general and vocational diseases and ensuring the comprehensive development of the individual are the basic directions which must be taken into consideration in drafting measures to improve labor conditions. Often contemporary high production equipment, which upgrades production efficiency, has

an adverse impact on man: increased noise and vibrations, dust and toxic substances. Other factors of technical progress as well have an adverse impact on man.

N. Kalinina, head of the labor improvement sector, Labor Scientific Research Institute, writes that "the use of mechanization facilities in clearing coal mine faces and drilling combines in preparatory shafts in some mines have led to a sharp increase in the concentration of dust and noise levels in the work areas. The length of time of their impact on man has increased and so has the number of production workers exposed to such influences. Adverse labor conditions develop not only in the course of operating physically and morally obsolete equipment but frequently in new industrial projects as a result of the imperfect consideration of economic requirements and labor safety standards. Practical experience indicates that sometimes the engineering organizations try artificially to lower the cost of projects by reducing outlays for the mechanization of manual operations and measures ensuring favorable labor conditions, for such a method used in "upgrading economic efficiency" is not only not punished but is even rewarded. As a result, many plans for new industrial projects (equipment, technological processes and plants) are not fully consistent with ergonomic and labor safety standards which ensure favorable working conditions."

The author is perfectly justified in believing that in the formulation and implementation of a comprehensive target program a better study must be made of data on use of manual work and labor conditions at work places. The necessary measures must be planned properly and their socioeconomic efficiency determined. N. Kalinina formulates specific suggestions on the introduction of additional indicators to the "card (passport) for manual, physical, heavy and unskilled labor," and linking such indicators to statistical accountability.

A number of critical remarks related to planning indicators are expressed by other journal readers as well. "Anyone related to planning and implementation of assignments on reducing the share of manual labor," note engineers R. Kaprano and V. Isakov (Leningrad), "read with great satisfaction the article 'Shifting Manual Labor to Machines.' The article raised accurately and at the proper time the question of the 'imperfection of current methods for determining the level of labor mechanization,' and the 'very controversial indicators' which 'can occasionally lead to paradoxical situations,' that 'the time has come to remove such contradictions,' and so on. A great deal of time has passed since the publication of the article and we believe that in their further work on improving planning indicators and accountability of manual labor the USSR Gosplan and Central Statistical Administration will take into consideration these remarks and suggestions."

The answers emphasize that on the initiative of enterprises and construction projects in the Latvian SSR and Zaporozhe, Chelyabinsk and Kuybyshev oblasts and with the active support of party organs comprehensive programs for reducing the use of manual labor during the five-year period and beyond it were developed and are being implemented with the active support of the party organs.

However, the study of many of them," writes Candidate of Economic Sciences L. Daullov, head of the labor resources department, Labor Scientific Research Institute, "proves how frequently the prevailing approach in them is the technical-economic and sometimes even the purely technical, in resolving problems. The program will not plan the transfer of people released from manual labor to other positions or their retraining. When we read that in one oblast or another the work of several tens of thousands of people has been mechanized we unwittingly ask where are such people currently employed, what kind of labor life they lead after such a drastic change, and are they satisfied with the content and conditions of their work in their new jobs and with their wages?"

In the course of the study of this process, the Labor Scientific Research Institute questioned more than 400 workers who had shifted from manual to mechanized work in several industrial enterprises. The overwhelming majority among them were assigned new jobs in accordance with their wishes. However, we are concerned by the fact that only 39 percent of the workers were trained in their new skills in courses and that more than half of them mastered their new skills in the least effective manner, after spending 1 or 2 weeks as individual or brigade students, and that 9 percent received no training whatsoever. Clearly, this does not contribute to the high efficiency of their labor in their new jobs. It does not create a base for truly mastering their skill and for professional advancement. Their labor conditions have by far not always improved (as reported by 25 percent of the workers). Such cases were particularly frequent in converting from manual to mechanized molding in casting shops. The study revealed that when manual labor is reduced production workers over 40 years old with longer labor seniority and low educational level, found themselves in a disadvantageous position. Only 47 percent of them earned more in their new jobs, while 15 percent even took a pay cut. This situation could hardly be considered normal.

Therefore, the process of releasing workers from manual labor and their reassignment and placement, currently taking place on a relatively modest scale, is not deprived of some negative aspects in the least, aspects which have an adverse effect on adaptation and lay the foundations for future turnover. Obviously, it would be expedient to include in the comprehensive target programs for reducing manual labor the optimal solution of problems of labor mobility for the released workers and the social problems which arise in this connection.

Although the main objective of socioeconomic development is one and the same, the tasks facing the individual sectors and areas vary. The main function of the former is the production of specific goods and services, whereas the latter concentrates above all on ensuring proper conditions for human activities. This frequently leads to the appearance of conflicting situations. For example, the sectorial organs are interested in the fullest possible availability of manpower for the enterprises, whereas the regional, conversely, in reducing the number of people employed in plants, factories and associations and ensuring the further development of services above all by reducing the use of manual labor. The readers cite examples of a narrow departmental approach to the solution of this problem. However, they also report experiences in the successful coordination of territorial with sectorial planning. In Moscow, for example, an efficient organizational and

methodical system has already been developed for their interconnection. It is based on the comprehensive target program for upgrading labor effectiveness and ensuring the thrifty utilization of manpower. It was developed with the participation of 67 ministries and departments, 30 sectorial administrations of the Moscow City Executive Committee, and several thousand Moscow enterprises and organizations. As a result, as early as 1980, the trend toward increasing the volume of output through the recruitment of additional manpower was essentially surmounted. The Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee set the industrial enterprises the assignment of reducing the size of their personnel by an average of 6.5 percent. However, the collectives of many enterprises formulated programs calling for a reduction of their manpower by 7-8.5 percent for the five-year period.

The authors note that the country has a number of organizational structures engaged in problems of reducing manual labor. All kinds of comprehensive target programs are being drafted (republic, oblast, plant, scientific and technical, etc.); regional production facilities are being established for the manufacturing of various technical facilities. However, the organization of such work is inefficient. In the majority of cases it is carried out on a voluntary basis and has not been legislated. Target programs are insufficiently substantiated and poorly supported with material and technical facilities. No efficient supervisory system over their implementation has been organized.

The practice of socialist economic management is familiar with several organizational methods used in the implementation of comprehensive programs. The most popular is the creation of a special authority or head department (frequently provisional, for the time it takes to resolve existing problems), which carry out the bulk of the work and are responsible for the final end results. This method is unsuitable if the problem to be resolved has various intersectorial aspects which run through the entire national economic complex. Such precisely is the problem of reducing the use of manual labor, which covers all aspects of production activity without exception, including a long list of heterogeneous steps leading to end results.

In this connection, Dr. of Economic Sciences V. Rappaport, head of laboratory at the USSR Academy of Sciences and State Committee for Science and Technology Systems Research All-Union Scientific Research Institute, believes that one should not define "from above" and in advance the specific results of the sum total of measures which could become part of such a comprehensive program or estimate the resources needed for its implementation and determine all sources for such resources. In his view, the implementation of such programs requires less direct administrative acts than a method for economic regulation based on scientific norms.

Instead of specific assignments on the absolute release of manpower resources based on the type of work, sector and area, V. Rappaport calls for formulating normative levels of manual labor outlays as part of the overall labor outlays. "Such norms," he believes, "would actively influence the process of planning and implementation of measures to reduce manual labor. It would enable us to regulate admissible outlays and assess the level of planned decisions. The study of actual deviations from the norms would enable us to determine precisely and comprehensively all bottlenecks, determine the main

directions of the work and provide administrative control over its implementation. Finally, such norms should also become the base of economic incentive in the formulation and implementation of measures to reduce manual and heavy work. Thus, in enterprises in which the amount of manual labor is above the norm it would clearly be expedient to apply a variety of economic sanctions such as limiting the number of working people and material stocks, freezing bonuses to managerial personnel, etc. In plants, factories and associations the outlays of which are below the norm corresponding benefits could be granted which would make the more intensive development of output possible."

According to the author, such incentives and penalties would force the enterprises to formulate on a decentralized basis steps to reduce manual and heavy labor out of their own funds or bank loans (it would be expedient to make loans for such purposes at lower interest rates and leave all profits at the disposal of the enterprise if they are to be used for other measures included in the program). As a result, the central economic management organs would be **freed from** the need to issue a number of directive assignments in this area and to supervise their implementation.

"The elaboration of a system of norms governing the level of manual labor outlays," V. Rappaport writes, "should obviously be assigned to specialized organizations, such as planning and norming scientific research institutes, the Central Labor Norms Bureau, or the Standardization All-Union Scientific Research Institute. The Labor Scientific Research Institute could formulate systems for rewards and sanctions related to the observance of such norms."

Obviously, neither these nor other recommendations are uncontroversial. They merit additional discussion and better substantiation of the formulated new approaches. They must also be tested and developed in detail. It is entirely clear, however, that we need a system for managing the program for reducing manual labor, which would clearly establish individual responsibility and grant the necessary rights for its implementation and ensure the systematic coordination and reciprocal interconnection among the activities of dozens of ministries and departments and hundreds of thousands of enterprises, organizations and establishments.

The efficient utilization of manpower resources is a major national economic reserve. At the November 1982 and June 1983 Central Committee plenums, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, noted that in order to upgrade production efficiency we must drastically reduce manual and heavy physical, unskilled and monotonous labor and make extensive use of robots, particularly in sectors in which manual labor is used. This will make it possible for hundreds of thousands of people to work under more favorable conditions and will bring us closer to resolving one of the basic problems in building communism--eliminating the existing disparities between physical and mental work. The thrifty attitude toward labor resources should be secured by an entire system of practical steps, above all on the part of the USSR Gosplan and Gossnab, ministries and departments, by summing up domestic and global experience and combining the knowledge of the best practical workers and scientists.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

A PARTY COMMITTEE STUDIES PUBLIC OPINION

PM071157 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83) pp 122-125

[Article by Dr of Philosophical Sciences V. Korobeynikov]

[Text] The materials of the 25th and 26th party congresses and the CPSU Central Committee June 1983 Plenum and other party documents indicate the need to devote special attention to the profound, comprehensive study of public opinion. In accordance with the USSR Constitution this is one element in the further development of socialist democracy. The consistent, multifaceted implementation of this provision is an important component in improving developed socialism.

The dynamics of Soviet society's life, the increasing complexity of present-day social processes, and the strengthening of the party's ties with the people require an expansion of the forms and means of recording and implementing the opinions, assessments, and proposals of the broad masses. This objective need is reflected in our party's day-to-day activity. As was stressed at the 26th CPSU Congress, all party committees have begun to make more active use of information from primary party organizations, which helps them to take account of public opinion and form a better idea of the state of affairs locally. Moreover, it was noted, our mass information and propaganda media have always been a true platform for party and nationwide public opinion. At the same time the congress noted the need to analyze the phenomena of society's political life more profoundly and boldly and to overcome shortcomings in the study of public opinion. That is why in recent years party committees, while continuing to use and develop the traditional political methods, have increasingly frequently resorted to sociological research to reveal people's opinions and sentiments. As was noted at the CPSU Central Committee June 1983 Plenum, interesting experience has accumulated in Azerbaijan, Belorussia, Georgia, Latvia, Uzbekistan, and a number of RSFSR and Ukrainian obkoms.

Thus the Council for the Study of Public Opinion set up under the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee was the prototype for a new organizational form of the integration of sociological science with party practice. This form, with certain variations, has now become established as entirely stable and mass-based. I refer to the scientific consultative bodies of a sociological orientation (centers, councils, institutes, groups, and so forth) for the study of public opinion which operates under party committees (republican,

kray, oblast, city and rayon). Such bodies, of which there are already hundreds in the country (and in future every one of the more than 4,500 party committees from republican level down to rayon level will obviously have one), make use of permanent applied science subdepartments as well as groups of sociologists working on a voluntary basis. As a rule their composition is determined by the committee bureau, and indeed in general they are led by the secretariat and personally by the ideology secretary.

The system of work by the new scientific consultative subdepartments has also become established on the whole. Their plans are drawn up on the basis of recommendations and requests from sections of the party committee concerned, individual sectors of the subdepartment itself, and the mass information and propaganda media, as well as working people's proposals. The thrust of the research is dictated by party interests. The organizational unity of the consultative sociological component is secured on the basis of ensuring that the system for studying public opinion approximates as closely as possible to the interests of the party organization and all working people, by making multifaceted social information available to leadership organs, by increasing the effectiveness of utilization of the force of public opinion in improving the mechanism for the management of public life and production, and by the opportunity to resolve urgent problems on the spot.

Generalizing the accumulated experience of applying the results of sociological research in their practical work, certain republican, kray, and oblast party committees have adopted special resolutions providing for concrete directions, forms, and methods of the study of public opinion in the interests of party organizations and have also clearly defined the aims, tasks, and structure of the new scientific consultative organs.

For instance, the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee resolution "On Further Improving the Study of Public Opinion and Sociological Research in the Republic in the Light of the 26th CPSU Congress Decisions" indicates that the study of public opinion and sociological research are increasingly becoming an important component in the adoption of decisions by party, soviet, and economic organs and are widely utilized in preparing questions for discussion at bureau meetings and plenums of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, party and economic aktiv meetings, and scientific and practical conferences. The comprehensive plans for economic and social development of many cities and rayons, enterprises, and institutions, as well as long-term plans for ideological and political education work, have been elaborated on the basis of the study of public opinion and sociological research. In 1981 the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee also adopted a resolution on further improving the system for the study, consideration, formation, and prediction of public opinion.

The specific forms of the study of public opinion which are presented are diverse. They have also been tested in the practice of party work. Thus the provision on the Institute of Public Opinion and Social Problems attached to Rostov CPSU Obkom states that the presidium of the institute's council prepares and submits for examination by the bureau of secretariat, with the participation of workers in the party obkom apparatus, analytical information,

draft resolutions, and memoranda drawn up on the basis of the analysis and generalization of research. Also on the basis of research results, recommended topics are submitted to the CPSU obkom bureau for the use of commentators, information workers, and observers in the mass media in relation to various aspects of the oblast's life with a view to promoting the working people's political activeness and ensuring the purposeful formation of public opinion.

All this is evidence that the study of public opinion by sociological methods improves the standard of party leadership and helps strengthen the unity of the party and people.

The effectiveness of public opinion is a most important feature of socialist democracy. The party teaches that reliance on public opinion is the guarantee of success in any sphere of our society's life. The ability to interest and organize people, promote creative inclinations in them, and ensure coordination in discussions, decisions, and actions by the collective--all these are necessary conditions of the implementation of large-scale tasks--tasks which are, to a significant extent, new--in all spheres of economic and social progress, as was indicated by the CPSU Central Committee November 1982 and June 1983 plenums.

And conversely, any initiative can be jeopardized if people do not grasp its meaning, if they have no interest in its fulfillment, if the collective mind is not aroused. "The formalist, preparing a decision," K. U. Chernenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, wrote, "does not worry about studying people's opinions, proposals or views, or about convincing them of the need to implement particular measures."

Socialist democracy offers wide scope for the free expression of opinions by various population groups. In the conditions of mature socialism public opinion acquires special force as a result of the expansion of practical participation by the broad masses of the people in the management of public and state affairs. On the basis of this objective factor many party committees consider it necessary, after studying materials from public opinion research at the bureau, secretariat, or plenum, to distribute the documents and recommendations adopted on the basis of such research to the lower party organizations, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organs, and also the institutions directly concerned by the research.

Let us cite a few concrete examples of the consideration of public opinion in the practice of party work.

On the eve of the Summer Olympics in Moscow, on the initiative of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Ideology commission, specialists from the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research conducted a poll entitled "Muscovites on the 1980 Olympics." At the same time an analysis was conducted of the content of publications carried by the newspapers MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, MOSKOVSKIY KOMSMOLETS, and VECHEERNYAYA MOSKVA publicizing the preparations for the Olympics. Comparison of the results of the two studies showed that

the capital's inhabitants were interested in a far wider range of topics. Moreover the hierarchy of readers' interests differed considerably from the hierarchy of topics in the newspapers. Thus the vast majority of Muscovites showed an interest first and foremost in questions of the provision of amenities in the city, the development of transport and communications networks within the city, and the improvement of work by the service sphere (68-84 percent of those polled), and also in the cultural program for the 1980 Olympics and the training of our athletes. These and other issues were proposed by the Moscow CPSU Gorkom for publicizing in the Moscow newspapers during the period of preparations for the Olympics.

Interesting facts on the consideration of public opinion in work in selecting, placing, and educating cadres were cited at the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee February 1983 Plenum. With the help of the Central Committee's public opinion center, the working people's opinion about the leaders of collectives was studied. The point is that party organizations have decisively rejected the standard references on leadership workers. Now workers' collectives, primary party organizations, party raykoms and gorkoms, and Central Committee sections take part in compiling these references. The opinions expressed locally make it possible more accurately to present the political, practical, and moral qualities of people being recommended for leadership posts and prevent conscious or unintentional violations by them of the norms of party life.

A public opinion poll conducted in Azerbaijan in 1982 on entrance examinations to VUZs enabled the republic party organization to adopt a number of effective measures to qualitatively improve the situation in this sector of work. This undoubtedly increased confidence among the population that the sole criterion for admission to a VUZ is the applicant's level of knowledge.

In view of the complexity and diversity of the tasks resolved by party committees, the activity of scientific consultative organs which discover and analyze the opinion of the broad public on particular issues should be further improved. Here it is necessary to improve the quality of party leadership of this work. This is being discussed increasingly frequently and thoroughly at various conferences, meetings, and scientific and practical conferences. Party workers note that increasing the efficiency of measures adapted to further improve the practice of the study and consideration of public opinion and the masses' mood is an important component of the restructuring of ideological work which the 26th Congress set as a target for the party. Many concrete proposals in this direction have already been put forward.

Thus, for instance, the recommendations to party organs made by the scientific and practical conference of party committee secretaries of Georgian, Armenia, and Azerbaijan held in Baku in November 1982 on "Experience in the Study of Public Opinion, the Masses' Sentiments, and Questions Which Concern People: The Practice of the Priority Briefing of the Ideological Aktiv" include the following points:

Party committees must coordinate and direct work to collect and process information on the state of public opinion;

Chief and central subdepartments for the study of public opinion must purposefully coordinate the activity of groups for the study of public opinion operating under gorkoms, raykoms and primary party organizations;

Typical enterprises and labor collectives must be defined for the purpose of holding instant polls on topical problems in present-day life, elaborating the most expedient forms and methods of the study of public opinion, instilling in cadres skill and experience in sociological research, and improving their qualifications.

A number of practical measures to increase the effectiveness of the study and consideration of public opinion were discussed at the all-union conference of ideological workers held in March 1983 at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences.

As analysis shows, questions of coordinating public opinion studies ensuring their interdependence and complementarity at various levels, and creating standard methods and programs are now particularly urgent.

Some work in this direction has been under way for a number of years at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research, whose structure includes a specialized subdepartment--the department of the sociological study of public opinion.

The department carries out not only fundamental research, including the study of the nature and essence of the mechanisms of formation and functioning of public opinion, but also many tasks of an applied nature. They are mainly implemented on a countrywide scale or in large regions. Comparing the data obtained makes it possible to reveal basic trends in the development of Soviet people's consciousness and to form a clear, accurate idea of the ideological situation.

In recent years, on the instructions of party organs, the department has carried out dozens of psychological studies of public opinion, including one among PRAVDA readers. In the course of this study some 10,000 people at 375 centers in the Soviet Union were polled by means of interviews. Two studies were carried out separated by an interval of 6 years in Vitebsk. The published results of the pre-Olympic poll gave rise to evident surprise in the West that we regularly study public opinion by sociological methods. And, lastly, in 1982 the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research jointly with the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences and Stavropol CPSU Kraykom conducted a survey of 2,500 people.

What are the main results of these and other public opinion polls? The main conclusion drawn on the basis of analysis of the data obtained is that Soviet people receive the party's plans with tremendous interest, support them, and seek ways of speedily implementing them. The proposals on imposing order and discipline and increasing labor productivity contained in the documents of the CPSU Central Committee November 1982 Plenum proved to be profoundly consonant with the masses' aspirations and sentiments. The results of our polls are eloquent proof of this. They confirm the idea voiced by Comrade Yu. V.

Andropov at his meeting with Moscow machine tool-building workers: "This means that what was discussed at the plenum really concerned people's interests."

Yes, that is so. For instance, in answer to the question: "What ways of resolving the current five-year plan tasks seem to you the most effective and promising at your enterprise (organization)?" some two-thirds of Moscow working people polled in 1981 mentioned improving working conditions and labor organization, followed by strengthening labor discipline (55 percent), and stepping up the struggle against drunkenness, slipshod work, embezzlements of socialist property, and so forth (40 percent). Answering a similar question in 1982, the inhabitants of Stavropol Kray placed the strengthening of labor discipline first (58 percent), with the struggle against drunkenness, slipshod work, and embezzlement second (54 percent), followed by improving working conditions and labor organization (45 percent), strict savings of raw materials, metals and other resources (28 percent), and improving the standard of leadership (26 percent).

The results of the study of public opinion also show that questions concerning ethical problems and the moral and psychological climate in various social communities and in labor collectives are invariably at the center of Soviet people's attention. The greatest interest is aroused by people's relationships in production, in the family, and in public places, in particular the relationships between leaders and subordinates (improving order and discipline, favoritism, the exploitation of official positions, and so forth), between production frontrunners and laggards, and between cadre workers and young workers.

It is obviously very important now to collect and generalize this experience so that all party organizations can make use of it.

Unfortunately we still have examples of accurate information about the state of public opinion being ignored or undervalued.

When our country carried out such an important step as the introduction of summer and winter time, a great deal was calculated and economically substantiated. But as it subsequently transpired, this step was not correct in all regions.

In particular, insufficient account was taken of the interests and opinions of people living in regions directly adjacent to Moscow Oblast and oriented toward Moscow time (Yaroslavl Oblast, for instance). When these localities were transferred to another time, different from Moscow's, the accustomed rhythm of people's life was disrupted and instances of lateness for work became more frequent. It turned out that we had gained in some respects and lost in others. At the scientific and practical conference held in February 1982 on "The Role of Party Committees, in the Study and Formation of Public Opinion," organized by the Rybinsk party gorkom, it emerged that one topical question of concern to the population was the problem of Moscow time. Now the situation has changed--people's opinion has been taken into account.

The materials cited make it possible to judge the scale, depth, and regularity of the consideration of public opinion in the party committee's concrete work. Its effectiveness in a given area can be assessed, first, by the frequency and thrust of the consideration of this factor in the course of party committee bureau sessions, plenums, and active and also at scientific and practical conferences and other party meetings. Second, by how the results of the study of public opinion are utilized in the party committee's decisions and resolutions. Third, by the continuity and concretization of the consideration of public opinion in the practical activity of party committees at various levels. The party committee must take care to give working people up-to-date, comprehensive information on the level of consideration of their opinions and proposals. If opinion is only partly taken into account, a well-argued explanation of the reason should be given. In the conditions of the democracy of developed socialism, every voice must be heard in good time and everyone's opinion must be heeded and taken into account in resolving vitally important reasons for an individual collective or the whole country. The party is guided by V. I. Lenin's instruction on the need "soberly to monitor the real state of the consciousness and level of preparation of the entire class (and not only its communist vanguard), of the whole mass of working people (not only the leading people)" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 42).

Analysis of the existing organizational structure of the study of public opinion in our country shows that we have sufficient prerequisites for its study on a unionwide scale. Let us recall that back in 1980 the journal *KOMMUNIST* raised the question of the need to "create a flexible, effective system of mass polls on a countrywide scale, which would make it possible to secure a degree of reliability and representativeness in their results such that the system would be a reliable backup for the practice of party leadership and state administration."

It was noted at the CPSU Central Committee June 1983 Plenum that in sociological research into ideological activity it is necessary to make the transition from evaluations of the state of ideological processes to predicting them, from disparate studies of public opinion to a systematic approach. As is known, the plenum instructed the USSR Academy of Sciences and the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences to submit proposals for increasing the role of sociological research in organizing educational activity and for organizing an all-union center for the study of public opinion based on the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research.

The creation of a center based specifically on the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research is highly rational from both the scientific and the practical viewpoint. Here there are trained cadres and the necessary material base, including computer technology. It is very important for the future center to make full use of the achievements of sociological science for the resolution of the key practical tasks facing the party and country and for it to become the basic component which is now emerging.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

CSO: 1802/18

BASIC WORK ON THE HISTORY OF THE WORKING CLASS IN RUSSIA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 83 (signed to press 11 Aug 83)
pp 126-128

[Review by F. Vaganov, doctor of historical sciences, and G. Ionova, candidate of historical sciences, of the book "Istoriya Rabochego Klassa SSSR. Rabochiy Klass Rossii ot Zarozhdeniya do Nachala XX v." [History of the USSR Working Class. The Working Class in Russia From Its Inception to the Beginning of the 20th Century]. M. S. Volin and Yu. I. Kir'yanov, responsible editors. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 575 pp (books within this series entitled "The Working Class and the First Russian Revolution of 1905-1907" and "The Working Class in Russia 1907-February 1917" came out in 1981-1982)]

[Text] A multiple-volume work, the first book of which, "The Working Class of Russia From Its Inception to the Beginning of the 20th Century" was recently published, deals with the heroic history of the working class in the USSR. This fundamental work sums up the results of long years of comprehensive efforts of historians, economists and ethnographers. It covers a tremendous period, from the 17th century to 1904, and ends with a large section on the growth of the mass economic struggle waged by the working class into a political struggle and the creation of a proletarian party of a new type, headed by V. I. Lenin, at the Second RSDWP Congress.

The need for such a study had been felt for some time. The new work reflects the successes achieved in the development of Soviet historical science. This also applies to the interpretation of a number of basic problems, such as the creation of a proletarian party of a new type, shifting the center of the global revolutionary labor movement in Russia, and others, and the deeper interpretation of some problems, such as the industrial revolution, the boundaries of the "working class" concept, and others, as well as the introduction in scientific circulation of a number of documentary materials and statistical data on strikes and other forms of struggle. The work is a comprehensive study of problems of the numerical strength, composition and status of the workers, their ideology, morality and culture, the development of the struggle, and the establishment and shaping of the proletariat as a class, as a social and political force and the hegemonistic power in the liberation movement, and the activities of the vanguard of the working class --the revolutionary social democrats--and the emergence of the Russian proletariat in the leading ranks of the international labor movement.

The work begins with a study of the processes which marked the birth of the cadres of **hired labor** under the feudal-serfdom economic system

when capitalism was developing. The authors, who have summed up extensive data from specialized research, trace the process of the appearance and development of industry based on the use of hired labor. During the second half of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th centuries, in the economically developed cities in Russia 20 to 25 percent of the manpower came from trading quarters while 50 to 60 percent of the manpower came from the salt-smelting centers. As early as the 17th century the main feature of the labor market in Russia under serfdom conditions had already been shaped: the season worker was forced to sell his manpower. Unlike his Western European counterpart, he was not personally free. Another characteristic feature of this process was the existence of attached workers in heavy industry and serfs working the hereditary textile mills. These features remained in Russia for the duration of serfdom, and it was only after that that the history of the proletariat as a separate class in Russian society began. Under these circumstances and in the labor movement antifeudal and anticapitalist features were combined.

The authors not only consider problems of the participation of working people in the peasant wars but also describe the way the very content of their struggle changed. For almost 150 years the activities of the attached peasants were focused on the elimination of their indentured state in factories. However, specific worker requirements were being formulated with increasing activeness, such as demands for higher wages, regular payments, and so on.

The simultaneous parallel development of petty commodity production and capitalist manufacturing and factories was a characteristic Russian feature. Whereas in a number of Western European countries capitalist production systematically went through these stages, in Russia, as in other countries which took the path of capitalist development later, such processes developed on a parallel basis.

A capitalist organization of production had become essentially established in the textile industry by 1860. The use of hired labor penetrated mining, where serfdom labor predominated. The overall number of hired workers reached half a million. The study of the processes of the development of worker cadres in the prereform period helps us properly to understand the long prehistory of the proletariat, for it is precisely this which led to the fast appearance of the working class as a class within capitalist society in the arena of the social struggle after the elimination of serfdom.

The authors convincingly describe the upsurge in the struggle waged by workers during the 1859-1861 revolutionary situation. At that time the struggle of the workers was of a general democratic nature. It was a component of the first democratic pressure which led to the fall of the serfdom system.

The study focuses on the development of the proletariat as a class within capitalist society and of the labor movement under capitalist conditions. The socioeconomic processes and the course of the industrial revolution which changed the development of production forces and radically amended the very nature of hired labor, converting it into the dominating area of production relations, despite the substantial number of serfdom vestiges, are considered

on the basis of extensive and specific data from a variety of sources. The authors make a detailed study of production-technical and hygienic labor conditions which failed to meet basic safety and hygiene standards and cite extensive documentary data provided by physicians describing the horrifying working and living conditions of textile and metallurgical workers, miners and petroleum workers. M. Gor'kiy wrote that he remembers the oilfields at the end of the 19th century as a brilliant image of a sinister hell. The facts cited in the book prove that in tsarist Russia no substantial improvement in worker labor and living conditions could be achieved without a most stubborn struggle.

The contemporary bourgeois literature tends excessively to exaggerate the backwardness of Russia which allegedly was not ripe for a socialist revolution. Actually, the same processes of development of capitalism as in the other European countries could be found in Russia. This fact is convincingly proved in this work. On the basis of Leninist methodology, original data are cited on the size of all proletarian categories employed in material production. The dynamics of this indicator for the 1860-1900 period confirms the tempestuous increase in the number of workers--by a factor of 4.4--whereas the country's population increased by approximately 90 percent. These quantitative changes are considered in relation to important qualitative ones: the training of permanent cadres of factory-plant proletariat, the weakening and break of the tie between workers and the land, increased literacy and professional skills, and others.

One stage in the struggle waged by the Russian proletariat became noticeable starting in the mid-1890s. It was related to Lenin's theoretical and practical activities and the linking of the worker movement with scientific socialism. The struggle waged by the working class under the conditions of tsarist political oppression assumed a militant, a revolutionary nature and became the objective foundation for the appearance of militant revolutionary Marxist organizations.

The book describes two trends in the labor movement: revolutionary and reformist, opportunistic. The various stages of the dynamics of the merger of the worker movement with scientific socialism is traced; the pattern of this process is described and the struggle waged by the revolutionary social democrats against opportunism is described comprehensively. The Petersburg "Alliance for the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class," which was created in 1895 as the prototype of a party of a new type, became the initial step toward the implementation of Lenin's ideas on combining socialism with the labor movement.

A decisive stage in the development of the proletariat and its struggle on the eve of the 1905-1907 revolution, comprehensively described in the book with the help of extensive new documentary data, was related to the growth of the mass economic struggle waged by the working class into a political struggle. This stage covered the period between 1901 and 1904. Worker demonstrations in support of university students in February-March 1901, the "Obukhovo defense," the Rostov strike in November 1902, the general strikes in the southern Russian cities in the summer of 1903, the antiwar and antimobilization

actions in 1904 and the activities of Lenin's ISKRA were the most important landmarks along this path.

The Second RSDWP Congress, which opened 80 years ago, on 30 July 1903, completed the process of unification of revolutionary Marxist organizations in Russia on the basis of the ideological, political and organizational principles drafted by Lenin. The establishment of a Marxist party of a new type is described as the legitimate result of social developments. Its creation became the turning point of the liberation struggle waged by the Russian and international proletariat.

Let us particularly note original data citing the book on the strikes between 1901 and 1904, based on the "chronicle" of the labor movement. The authors did a great deal of work determining the number of strikers. Their overall data prove that in terms of strikers, as early as 1903 Russia was in a leading position in Europe and second in the world, surpassed only by the United States.

For the first time in our literature data are cited on worker street demonstrations during that period (there were almost 350 of them), confirming the increased political discontent of the proletariat. It is indicative that the number of demonstrations increased while the number of strikes and of striking workers declined in 1904 under the circumstances of the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War.

V. I. Lenin frequently pointed out qualities of the proletariat which helped it in its revolutionary struggle and in defeating its class enemy. "Firmness, persistence, readiness, resolve and ability to test correctly a hundred times whatever is necessary for the sake of reaching the target," he wrote, "were qualities which the proletariat developed within itself 10, 15 or 20 years before the October Revolution..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 40, p 316). One of the unquestionable success of the authors is their vivid characterization of the leading workers, such as P. A. Moiseyenko, V. S. Volkov, M. I. Kalinin, I. V. Babushkin and many others who embodied the best features of the working class.

The authors and the editors were able to resolve the main problem: to describe the general laws and characteristics of the shaping of the working class and its struggle, the establishment of the proletariat as a revolutionary class and the objective prerequisites leading to the creation of a militant revolutionary Marxist party of a new type. The work convincingly describes the way the working class in Russia developed its position in the international proletarian movement changed, from the 1870s, when the progressive Russian workers were already considering their struggle as part of the international labor movement, through the intensification of international solidarity in the 1880s and 1890s, to the transformation of the Russian working class into a leading detachment in the international labor movement at the turn of the 20th century, when the center of the global revolutionary movement began to shift to Russia and the Leninist stage in the development of Marxism began.

The work is distinguished by its strict choices of terminology, facts, dates and names and high level of scientific and artistic presentation.

It suffers from some shortcomings as well. In the first chapters the struggle of the workers is dealt with less than problems of numerical strength, composition and situation. The correlation between the structure, situation and struggle of the proletariat in Russia and the other countries at the different development stages should have been described more profoundly and fully.

As a whole, the book is a major contribution to the elaboration of basic problems of the history of the Russian proletariat. Through its profoundly scientific content it brings to the contemporary reader the breath of the past. It triggers a feeling of pride in the progressive representatives of the working class--the working people and fighters for social justice; it opens pages of the heroic history of the working class of Russia and its vanguard--the Leninist party.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/18

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

15 Nov. 1983